

THE
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N^O XXXIV. JANUARY 1884.

ART. I.—ENGLISH HEGELIANISM AND ITS
RELIGION.

1. *Prolegomena to Ethics.* By the late THOMAS HILL GREEN, Fellow of Balliol, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Edited by A. C. Bradley, M.A. (Oxford, 1883.)
2. *The Witness of God and Faith.* Two Lay Sermons by the late T. H. GREEN, M.A., LL.D. Edited by the late Arnold Toynbee, M.A., Tutor of Balliol College. (London, 1883.)
3. *Hegel.* By EDWARD CAIRD, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Glasgow. (Edinburgh and London, 1883.)
4. *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion.* By JOHN CAIRD, D.D., Principal of the University of Glasgow. (Glasgow, 1880.)

THE reader of Bishop Thirlwall's Letters will remember the judgment which that eminent prelate pronounces upon the philosophy of Hegel :—

‘My own examination of Hegel's works,’ he writes to Dr. Whewell, ‘which I had occasion to study attentively, has impressed me with the deepest conviction that he is, to say the least, one of the most impudent of all literary quacks, and I feel sure that there is no part of his so-called philosophy which if carefully examined by a competent and impartial judge would not lead him to a like conclusion.’¹

In this opinion the Christian Bishop agrees precisely with Schopenhauer the Pessimist, who pronounces that—

¹ *Letters of Bishop Thirlwall*, vol. i. p. 195.

'The greatest degree of impudence in serving up mere nonsense, in the stringing together of senseless raving word-stuff, such as hitherto had been heard only in mad-houses, presented itself in Hegel, and became the instrument of the merest general mystification that ever was seen, with results which posterity will regard as fabulous, and which will remain a standing monument of German foolishness.'¹

There must be some reason for these adverse testimonies, but they cannot be the whole truth. No writer who deserves such treatment as this could have furnished to some of the finest minds of our age and country the suggestions, not only of a philosophy, but of a religion.

It is in the religious aspect that we propose to notice this interesting phase of contemporary thought. But our attempt would be unintelligible if we did not preface it by some account, however superficial and imperfect, of the metaphysical views out of which the religion springs.

With many good persons the bare suggestion that a religion springs out of metaphysics is enough to condemn it. For how can it ever have been intended that the mass of simple people should puzzle their heads over philosophical inquiries as a preliminary to accepting the Gospel? It never was intended. Let those who can honestly do so content themselves with feeling and conscience as their guides. Provided they do not dishonestly suppress their reason, they may find better and more rational direction in their moral and emotional nature than reflection could have supplied to them. For with many men (and those not the least wise) reasoning is not the exercise of mind in which reason works most truly.

But in every age of Christianity, and in the present more than others, many find it necessary not merely to feel and act, but also to reflect. They are driven whether they will or no to reason about their faith: a process which certainly has its inevitable dangers, for the mind may assume so permanent an attitude of thinking as to forget feeling and action. But this is a danger of which wise thinkers, metaphysical as well as others, have shown themselves aware. Nor is it a danger which exists at all more in the branch of thought which we call philosophy than in the historical and literary inquiries in which others have sought their evidences of Christianity.

In its proper place as a handmaid and preparation of true feeling and true action the philosophy of the mind offers incontestably the most powerful support which reasoning can

¹ *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. Dritte Aufl., vol. i. p. 508.

render to any cause. For nothing can form a more essential element in any branch of knowledge than the extent and conditions under which our nature enables us to know. It would be a decisive argument against religion if it could be shown, as is often now pretended, that it leads us into regions in which knowledge is essentially impossible. On the other hand, if anything favourable to religion can be gathered from careful inquiry into the primary conditions of knowledge, we shall be sent forward to further inquiries with very different anticipations and demands from those which we should have made had this preliminary investigation been omitted. Indeed, under the present tyranny of physical science we are experiencing the consequences of assuming that the world is open to our inquiry, and launching out in search of knowledge without considering the mental nature which, being the only instrument by which we can know, must define the nature and limits of our knowledge.

True it is that even in the outside world of observation there are side by side with physical knowledge rich materials for the religious argument: stubborn facts of which a serious inquirer must take note or leave his inductions maimed and imperfect. But it is generally allowed that these outward observations are in the nature of probabilities, and that they cannot build up an argument for religion which is itself beyond a probability. Now in the outward world it has to compare with facts and with theories which triumphantly claim to be certainties. No wonder that it should frequently find itself thrust aside, and that there should be constant attempts to account for religion by the laws of physical science, or even to assume without proof that it falls within their operation.

Such being the treatment which religion meets from physical science, the prejudices of religious people against mental philosophy must be regarded as hardly less than suicidal. And we ought to feel infinite obligation to those earnest thinkers who, instead of joining the headlong rush into investigations of nature, as if the explanation of everything was there to be found, raise the previous question whether if there were not something beyond nature we could know even nature itself as we do.

When the religious inquirer places himself in the hands of the philosopher, he has a right to demand that the observations to which his assent is asked shall be made upon the general mind of man. The powers of human minds differ as those of human bodies, but in either case the structure is the same; and inquiries founded on individual peculiarities would be

useless for any purpose, but especially so in relation to religion. On the other hand, without defending the extraordinary obscurity of Hegel, we must not assume that philosophy, if true, should be easy of comprehension to untrained or inattentive minds. For the reflection and self-scrutiny which philosophy implies is most difficult precisely when applied to those simple movements on which we are least accustomed to reflect. And it would be as unreasonable to require that metaphysics should be level to the comprehension of all the men whose minds are its subject as that anatomy and physiology should be easy and accessible to those whose bodies furnish the material for those studies.

Perhaps there are few educated minds which have not at one time or another felt, if not faced, the great problem, How can I know? The external world cannot reach me, save through subjective experiences of my own: and who, therefore, shall assure me that the whole fabric of so-called external things, which I have supposed to constitute my knowledge, is anything more than a phantasmagoria which is somehow imaged to me, but the inner reality of which, if any reality it has, I can never touch. Locke felt some of the force of the question when he allowed that the secondary qualities of bodies are not in the things themselves, but in our own perceiving minds. Berkeley extended, as in reason bound, the same observation to the whole external world and all its qualities. Hume forced the argument to that complete scepticism to which it so evidently points. Kant showed that our knowledge does not consist merely of the outward world, nor its reality depend upon the reality of that outward world in itself. He proved that the mind brings a necessary action of its own to organize and combine those outward impressions, and he found real knowledge in the work of the mind itself: 'We know objects because, so far as their most general determinations are concerned, we produce the objects we know.'¹ What we call nature is not a mere series of impressions, but a system of related appearances, and relations are the work of the mind which perceives them. In this sense the understanding makes nature. But this by no means implies the absurdity, which an unthinking opponent is hasty to impute, of supposing that nature comes into existence at the moment when this or that person begins to think of it. This will, indeed, be the inevitable conclusion if the observer regards his own intelligence as dealing with a universe in which no other

¹ *The Philosophy of Kant*, by Professor Caird, p. 669.

intelligence can be found at work.¹ But it is impossible for our minds to do their work of combining our impressions into an intelligible nature, a system of sequence and law, without recognizing the fact that nature and our own intelligence along with it proceed from and are ruled by an all-comprehending intelligence above them both: 'We must hold that there is a consciousness for which the relations of fact that form the object of our gradually attained knowledge already and eternally exist; and that the growing knowledge of the individual is a progress towards this consciousness.'²

Kant, while proving that all knowledge can be only a knowledge of relations, and that all relation is the work of the mind, could not bring himself wholly to surrender the idea of outward existence unconnected with thought. He conceived that behind that relation to a perceiving intellect, which alone enables us to predicate anything whatever of things, there must be a somewhat which he calls the 'thing in itself.' Things in themselves contribute the matter of our experience, while the mind imparts its form.

The objections to this view are manifest.³ For this thing in itself must be something which stands in no relation to us; it is the residuum which remains in the vessel after all that forms our knowledge has been drawn off. Now, if it bears no relation to us, how can we know its existence? For we have been compelled to admit that we can know nothing except relatively to our thought. We cannot assert the existence of anything save in relation to thought, nor form the slightest notion of what existence out of relation to our thought would mean. Let the reader make the attempt, and he will probably end by assenting to Principal Caird, that—

'To go beyond or attempt to conceive of an existence which is prior to and outside of thought, "a thing in itself" of which thought is only the mirror, is self-contradictory, inasmuch as that very thing in itself is only conceivable by, exists only for, thought. We must think it before we can ascribe to it even an existence outside of thought.'⁴

If this reasoning be accepted, a man finds himself in the following condition. He is conscious of himself and he is conscious that he has to do with a whole universe of nature

¹ Green, *Prolegomena*, p. 38.

² *Ibid.* p. 75.

³ Schopenhauer, however, regards the doctrine of the 'thing in itself' as Kant's chief service to philosophy (*Die Welt*, &c., vol. i. p. 494). This means for Schopenhauer the dethroning of a supreme intelligence and the substitution, as maker and ruler of life, of a blind unknowing and unknown force, veiled by illusion. Not such was its meaning for Kant.

⁴ *Introduction*, p. 156.

which is not himself. But what these outward things are in themselves he knows not. Even to call them by the name of outward things is to attribute to them a quality which is derived from his own mind. The mind contributes, not something alone, but everything, to the knowledge of nature.¹ Reflecting so, we might be brought to think each one of his own self as being the only reality, and of all which we call knowledge as simply modifications of this self. This would probably be no unfair description of Fichte's position, but it is not Hegel's. To Hegel the self is as incapable of recognition without the not-self as the not-self without the self.

It is the law of thought that nothing can be conceived by our minds except through definitions which distinguish it from other things. It exists, therefore, for our thought only in relation to these other things which we must call in to lay down its bounds and limits, and if these limits and negations fall out of our thought it must fall along with them. In ceasing to be able to tell what the thing is not, we should cease to be able to tell what it is. This book which I see before me is defined as to size and shape by its relation to its bounding space. In thinking what it fills and what it is, I must think of what it does not fill and what it is not. And if this bounding space and the surrounding objects which it is not were to cease to exist for my thought, the book must cease to exist for me too. This distinction and separation of the book and the not-book implies a relation between the two and requires belief in a unity which includes in it both the book and the not-book. The extreme example of this leading principle in Hegel's philosophy is found in the astounding statement that Being and not-Being are identical. The meaning of this, as Professor Caird² is careful to explain to us, 'is not that Being and not-Being are not also distinguished; but it does mean that the distinction is not absolute, and that if it is made absolute, at that very moment it disappears.' But without troubling ourselves to grapple with such extremes of the principle, we can probably all conceive, and perhaps assent to, the general statement that, as we can conceive nothing to exist except in relation to thought, so we cannot think of anything except in relation to other things from which it stands distinguished, and the existence of which is necessarily implied by the existence of it.

Now, this law of thought, which as such is a law of existence, applies in its full force to our self-consciousness. We

¹ *Introduction*, p. 235.

² *Hegel*, p. 163.

cannot wholly separate-off ourselves from that which is not ourselves; for we can only think of self through its distinction from not-self and the distinction necessarily implies a relation between the self and not-self, and a unity of thought and of being in which both are comprehended. Self only exists through finding itself in that which is outward to self, while, again, this outward universe is only known in and through ourselves. And the very nature of human consciousness makes this the law of life: that neither anything that we know nor yet we ourselves can ever be said to *be* in such a sense as to form a fixed subject of thought independent of a relation to some other thing which the mind must pass to in the very act of thinking of its existence. Thus nothing *is*, but is becoming. We ourselves, in obedience to the ceaseless law of change, pass our lives in a constant development of the self into the not-self and the not-self into the self. 'At every stage of its growth and at every minutest portion of that stage the organism not only is, but is passing away from that which it is.'

One may assent to this account of consciousness and life as very true so far as it goes, and yet perceive that it is capable of perversion to the grossest absurdity both of theory and practice. It is, as Principal Caird observes, an 'obviously absurd assertion that the world only exists as we think it, that our poor thought creates and uncreates the world.' This is the exaggeration of one scale of the Hegelian balance. We can only find ourselves in the world by rendering ourselves up with unreserved submission to the outward facts. Our poor thought cannot create the world, and the same principle requires us to allow that we are equally incapable of creating any single fact in the world. But the other scale of the balance, the principle that the not-self gives us the self, is in its own way as liable to error. For it may be so exaggerated as to make us the mere sport of the change and flow of things which, taking up ourself, shall fill it with what contents they please, and make us live as their blind forces order.

The element which can alone preserve the system from these absurdities of extravagant egoism or fatalistic materialism is the principle that our intelligence, in its changeful work of informing the world and being by the world informed, must regard itself as the instrument of an intelligence which is eternal. 'Nature, the finite mind, and God or the infinite mind, are not discordant or irreconcilable ideas, but ideas which belong to one organic whole or system of knowledge.'¹

¹ *Introduction*, p. 233.

There is one sentence in the *Prolegomena* of Mr. Green which seems well to express the whole theory upon which his system is founded:—

‘Either we must deny the reality of relations altogether, and treat them as fictions of our combining intelligence: or we must hold that, being the product of our combining intelligence, they are yet empirically real on the ground that our intelligence is a factor in the real of experience: or if we suppose them to be real otherwise than merely as for us, otherwise than in the “cosmos of our experience,” we must recognize as the condition of their reality the action of some unifying principle analogous to our understanding.’¹

Again:—

‘Our action in knowledge, the action by which we connect successive phenomena in the unity of a related whole, is an action as absolutely from itself, as little to be accounted for by the phenomena through which it became an intelligent experience, or by anything alien to itself, as is that which we have found to be implied in the existence of the universal order. This action of our mind in knowledge—to say nothing of any other achievement of the human spirit—becomes to us when reflected on, a *causa cognoscendi* in relation to the action of a self-originating mind in the universe: which we then learn to regard as the *causa essendi* to the same action, exercised under whatever limiting conditions, by ourselves.’²

To the same effect Professor Caird:—

‘The process of the liberation of thought from itself is not the mere negation of thought, which would necessarily be the negation of the object of thought also: it is the negation of thought and being alike *as separate from each other*, and the revelation of their implicit unity. . . . That the intelligence can in its utmost self-surrender still maintain itself—that it can rise to a unity which is beyond its distinction from the object and its opposition to the object, is already the pledge that all such opposition and distinction may be overcome and resolved; or in other words, that the world may be shown to be not merely the object but the manifestation of intelligence;’

and he proceeds to inform us that ‘this doctrine, that we need only to cast aside all prepossessions and take the world as it is in order to find intelligence in it, is what Hegel attempts to prove in his *Logic*.’³

Professor Green works out an interesting illustration of his philosophy from the common phrase which speaks of us as studying the book of nature.

‘In reading a sentence we see the words successively, we attend to them successively, and we recall their meaning successively. But

¹ *Prolegomena*, p. 32. ² *Ibid.* p. 82. ³ Caird’s *Hegel*, pp. 156–7.

throughout that succession there must be present continuously the consciousness that the sentence has a meaning as a whole, . . . and when the reading is over, the consciousness that the sentence has a meaning has become a consciousness of what in particular the meaning is. . . . The reader has then, so far as that sentence is concerned, made the mind of the writer his own. . . . May we not take it to be in a similar way that the system of related facts which forms the objective world reproduces itself partially and gradually in the soul of the individual who in part knows it? That this system implies a mind or consciousness for which it exists as the condition of the union in relation of the related facts is not an arbitrary guess. We have seen that it is the only answer which we have any ground for giving to the question how such a union of the manifold is possible. . . . It would seem that the attainment of the knowledge is only explicable as a reproduction of itself in the human soul, by the consciousness for which the system of related facts exists—a reproduction of itself in which it uses the sentient life of the soul as its organ.’¹

In this brief account of the philosophical foundation of Hegelianism we necessarily omit the lengthy and difficult discussions in which it is sought to prove that all the categories of thought are involved in the reciprocity of self and not-self; a description which covers equally man’s acquisition of knowledge and the work of his desires. But enough has perhaps been said to form an introduction to our chief design, which is to give some account of Hegelianism as a religion.

What, then, is religion according to the school of Hegel. It ‘is simply,’ says Principal Caird, ‘the return of the finite consciousness into union with the infinite, the reconciliation of the human spirit with the Divine.’² It is the application, upon the deepest and widest scale, of the metaphysical principles just laid down. These principles are the account of human life and thought as it is and must be. Religion is therefore universally and necessarily existent in man’s nature; but when this assertion is made it must not be taken to imply either that the religious ideas of all men have been coincident, or that that only is necessary in religion in which all men have concurred. ‘It is not that which is common to barbarism and civilization which is most truly human, but precisely that in which civilization differs from barbarism.’ In the same way, ‘the universal element in religion is not reached by leaving out, from the various positive religions the special characteristics which distinguish them from each other, and retaining only those ideas or beliefs which are found to be common to all.’³ The necessary existence of religion means that ‘the religious relation is involved in the very nature of man.’⁴

¹ *Prolegomena*, pp. 76-7.

² *Ibid.* p. 82.

³ *Introduction*, p. 52.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 85.

'The nature of man as a spiritual being involves these two things—(1) the capacity of transcending his own individuality, of finding or realizing himself in that which lies beyond him, and seems to limit him; (2) the latent or implicit consciousness of the absolute unity of thought and being, or of an absolute self-consciousness on which all finite knowledge and existence rest. In these two principles, the first of which implies the never-ending impulse to transcend ourselves: the second of which points to a Universal or Absolute Mind as that in which the effort to transcend ourselves finds its ultimate explanation, we discern, deep laid in man's nature, that which constitutes the basis of religion.'¹

But religion cannot be based on the nature of man alone. There must be a corresponding basis in the nature and acts of the Divine existence with whom religion brings him in contact. It is accordingly granted by Principal Caird that 'the notion of a Revelation, nay, rightly understood, of a supernatural Revelation, is presupposed in the nature of Religion, or forms the indispensable correlative of it.'² We naturally inquire further whether this Revelation comes in the only way in which we can conceive a Revelation coming—by facts. Principal Caird somewhat enigmatically declares that 'literally construed one series of facts is of no higher or more spiritual significance than another.' But he proceeds to allow that 'However we explain the process, the ordinary consciousness can and does read into such outward phenomena of human history conceptions, notions, ideas, which possess something of that universality and self-consistency, that absoluteness and necessity, which are the characteristics of truth.'³

Professor Green, indeed, declares that—

'The assertion that God exists cannot be verified like any other matter of fact. But what if that be, not because He is so far off, but because He is so near? You cannot know Him as you know a particular fact related to you, but neither can you so know yourself: and it is yourself, not as you are, but as in seeking Him you become, that is His revelation.'⁴

But this may be only a question of words; since Mr. Green would doubtless allow that neither we ourselves nor what we become can be known to us otherwise than by facts in our own history or that of mankind.

We next approach the question What is it that is revealed? Is it really God? We remember with uneasiness that Hegel at an early portion of his career held that 'the objectivity of God has gone hand in hand with the slavery and corruption of

¹ *Introduction*, p. 132.

² *Ibid.* p. 179.

³ *Ibid.* p. 65.

⁴ *Witness of God*, p. 95.

men,'¹ and that to the last he probably did not believe in what he here means by the objectivity of God.

Before we stigmatize Hegelianism as not possessing a real God we must, however, remember that the Being in whom 'we live and move and have our being' must be allowed to bear to us a relation different from that borne to us by men and things, and that the perception of this difference must not be taken to imply the denial of His reality. We should prefer to say that His existence is to us a fact and can be proved as such, though it is also much more than a fact, since it is the cause of all facts; and that the 'forms of imagination' in which after Scripture we express God's relations to us, though inadequate, are true. Holy Scripture, however, itself is wont to express the inadequacy of ideas by denying their truth; even while it claims for man, enlightened by revelation, a power to see God, it yet elsewhere declares that no man hath seen Him or can see. We shall not, therefore, be prone to accuse Professor Green of disbelief in a real God, because he asks, 'Is there really a Divine Ruler who issues commands which we can obey or disobey; who somehow sees and hears us though not through eye or ear; whom it is possible for us to please or offend?' and replies that 'there is undoubtedly a sense in which these questions once asked can only be answered in the negative. The most convinced theist must admit that God is as unimaginable as He is unperceivable.'² When we come to the practical working of the system which is, after all, the test, we must in fairness allow that it gives scope for the most thorough belief in God. The genuineness, not merely of Principal Caird's theism but of his Christianity, is undoubted. From Professor Green's views of Christianity we shall have to express strong dissent. But if words have meaning (and he was the last man to use words without meaning) his faith in God was deep and true. God is to him

'the eternal Spirit or self-conscious subject which communicates itself in measure and under conditions to beings who through that communication become spiritual.' 'He is not merely the Being who has made us in the sense that we exist as an object of the Divine consciousness in the same way in which we must suppose the system of nature so to exist; but He is a Being in whom we exist: with whom we are in principle one: with whom the human spirit is identical in the sense that He *is* all which the human spirit is capable of becoming.'³

In these high matters it is scarcely possible for the most careful thinkers to say anything which may not be assailed in

¹ Caird's *Hegel*, p. 33.

² *Prolegomena*, p. 347.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 194, 197-8.

some points of view and defended in others. But we feel more disposed to agree with these principles than with Archbishops King and Whately,¹ and Dean Mansel, who have seemed to teach that the only way in which God can be reached is through analogical expressions and never as He is. The latter view may be more justly accused of sacrificing the reality of God's connexion with our souls than the Hegelian of sacrificing His objective reality for our minds.

Many persons are ready to raise vague accusations of Rationalism against any system of thought. But it seems to us that little controversy can justly arise upon the contention of Principal Caird that religion is implicitly rational and is not concerned with the emotions alone;² especially when this is taken in connexion with Professor Green's elaborate proof that the exercise of the understanding and the feeling of desire ever accompany and imply each other,³ and with Hegel's conviction that the feelings are not so alien to reason as Kant had supposed, 'for love is the analogue of reason.' There is nothing in such a claim on the part of reason which has not been repeatedly recognized in Christian theology. Theology has, in fact, been raised upon this basis.

But an impression may probably be felt that Hegelianism is unfavourable to distinct belief in the Divine Personality. As regards the English branch of the school such an accusation would be wholly untrue. The very principle of the system is that the Divine mind is in unity with the human, and that both are personal.

'It is clearly,' says Professor Green, 'of the very essence of the doctrine above advanced that the Divine principle which we suppose to be realizing itself in man should be supposed to realize itself in persons as such. But for reflection on our personality, on our consciousness of ourselves as objects to ourselves, we could never dream of there being such a self-realizing principle at all, whether as implied in the world or in ourselves. It is only because we are consciously objects to ourselves that we can conceive a world as an object to a single mind, and thus as a connected whole.'⁴

He adds, with great justice, that personality is a term which has often been fought over without any very precise meaning being attached to it, and explains it to mean for him 'the quality in a subject of being consciously an object to itself.'

If we were now examining the philosophical basis of He-

¹ See Archbishop King's discourse appended to Whately's *Bampton Lectures* (third edition, London, 1833). ² *Introduction*, pp. 27, 45, 52.

³ *Prolegomena*, p. 135 ff.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 191.

gelianism, and comparing it with the prevalent doctrines of Evolution, we should here raise the question whether self-consciousness which plays so all-important a part in the theory is really anything more than a particular stage in the development of the human intellect, having its commencements even in the lower animals? Must not the intelligence which finds its objects in the world around also in the course of its development make an object of itself and of the other faculties which make up the man? We think it may be gathered from Professor Green that a proof that human self-consciousness is a development of mental powers found in lower creatures would not disturb his belief in the central character and the supreme importance of this self-consciousness as an existing fact, nor in the relationship to the Supreme mind which it implies in its possessors. But for our parts we suspect that a good deal of what Professor Green calls our self-consciousness is in fact only an exercise of intellect like others, and implying no more than others, and that the personality, the I, is something which lies behind all these reflections of the mind on itself, and, indeed, behind all human action. The reader will find a brief but very interesting discussion of the point in Professor Caird's *Hegel*¹ in reference to an opinion of Kant to this effect, for which we suspect more is to be said than the Professor allows.²

If personality be a principle of the system, sociality is equally so.

'The existence of a spirit in pure individuality apart from other spirits is not conceivable, for a spiritual being is one that finds itself only in what is other than itself. . . . As no adequate conception of the individual human spirit can be formed apart from its relation to other finite spirits, so must any representation of the finite spirit be inadequate and incomplete apart from its relation to the Infinite.'³ 'And the abstract individual is not truly man . . . the social relations are a necessary part of the being of the individual.'⁴

While, on the other hand, it is only for the personal development of the individuals who compose it that society exists,

'it is only so far as this development and direction of personality is obtained for all who are capable of it (as presumably everyone who says "I" is capable) that human society, either in its widest comprehension or in any of its particular groups, can be held to fulfil its function, to realize its idea as it is in God.'⁵

¹ P. 146.

² See this whole question ably discussed in *L'idée de la Personnalité dans la Psychologie Moderne*, par Ch. Jeannaire (Paris, 1882). Chap. VI. analyses Kant's doctrine of the *Ego*.

³ *Introduction*, p. 199.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 241-2.

⁵ *Prolegomena*, p. 202.

The co-ordinate principles of self-consciousness and self-surrender form the keynote of the system of Ethics which Professor Green has bequeathed to us, complete as a doctrine, though not in the details of its application.

'The self-conscious spirit of man presents its own perfection to itself as the intrinsically desirable . . . In thinking of ultimate good the educated citizen of Christendom thinks of it indeed necessarily as perfection for himself: as a life in which he shall be fully satisfied through having become all that the spirit within him enables him to become. But he cannot think of himself as satisfied in any life other than a social life, exhibiting the exercise of self-denying will, and in which the "multitude of the redeemed," which is all men, shall participate.'¹

Thus morality in the Hegelian view has an essentially religious basis. It rests upon the truth concerning our own nature, that of our neighbours, and that of God. Morality may, indeed, be treated in reference to the self-perfection of the individual. But this, as we have just seen, must be an essentially imperfect method; it cannot even be complete within its own sphere, for the individual cannot so much as realize to himself that which he himself is, in solitude and apart.

Equally plain is it that neither individual nor social morality can properly be treated apart from the relations of human nature individually and collectively to God. The relations of the Absolute Self-consciousness of God to every movement of the human self-consciousness are, if the Hegelian exposition be accepted, too close and of too overwhelming importance ever to be left out of sight. This is abundantly, and with great beauty of thought and style, maintained by Principal Caird.

'How can the division in man's nature be healed? . . . We have here the great problem to which morality or the moral life furnishes a partial solution, but which only religion can finally and completely solve.'² 'Social morality, even at the best: love and sacrifice, even if they reached the point of the extinction of any private self-will, are the identification of our individuality, not with an infinite, but only with an indefinitely progressive life.'³ 'To enter on the religious life is to terminate the struggle between my false self and that higher self which is at once mine and infinitely more than mine; it is to realize the latter as that with which my whole spiritual being is identified, so that "it is no longer I that live"—not any I that I can claim as my own—"but God that liveth in me." . . . Religion rises above morality in this, that whilst the ideal of morality is only progressively realized,

¹ *Prolegomena*, pp. 411-414.

² *Introduction*, p. 275.

³ *Ibid.* p. 292.

the ideal of religion is realized here and now. In that act which constitutes the beginning of the religious life—call it faith, or trust, or self-surrender, or by whatever name you will—there is involved the identification of the finite with a life which is eternally realized.¹

Nor are similar declarations by any means wanting in the work of Professor Green. The question, according to him, which 'lies at the root of ethical inquiry' is this: 'In what relation do we ourselves stand to the one self-distinguishing subject other than nature which we find to be implied in nature.'² It would be difficult to render a more comprehensive account of human life, and of the supreme end and solution of its struggles, than this: 'Self-satisfaction is the form of every object willed; but the filling of that form, the character of that in which self-satisfaction is sought, ranging from sensual pleasure to the fulfilment of a vocation conceived as given by God, makes the object what it really is.'³ No words can better interpret the moral consciousness of a religious man, either as regards his personal failures and hopes or the spirit in which he regards the moral development of the world, than these: 'The practical struggle after the Better, of which the idea of there being a Best has been the spring, has taken such effect in the world of man's affairs as makes the way by which the Best is to be more nearly approached plain enough to him that will see.' This statement implies the assumption,

'that this Best state of man is already present to some divine consciousness, so that it may properly be said to be the vocation of man to attain it; that some unfulfilled and unrealized, but still operative, idea of there being such a state has been the essential influence in the process by which man has so far bettered himself; and that a continued operation of the same idea in us, with that growing definiteness which is gathered from reflection on the actions and institutions in which it has so far manifested itself, is the condition of character and conduct being morally good in the proper sense of the words.'⁴

And if justification of this belief be required, Professor Green refers us back, as we should expect, to the metaphysical basis upon which in the Hegelian system all knowledge and all thought, moral as well as other, rests:—

'We saw reason to hold that the existence of one connected world, which is the presupposition of knowledge, implies the action of one self-conditioning and self-determining mind; and that, as our knowledge, so our moral activity was only explicable on supposition of a certain reproduction of itself, on the part of this eternal mind,

¹ *Introduction*, p. 297.

² *Prolegomena*, p. 5

³ *Ibid.* p. 161.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 180-1.

as the self of man. . . . Proof of such a doctrine, in the ordinary sense of the word, from the nature of the case there cannot be. It is not a truth deducible from other conceded or established truths. It is not a statement of an event or matter of fact that can be the object of experiment or observation. It represents a conception to which no perceivable or imaginable object can possibly correspond, but one that affords the only means by which, reflecting on our moral and intellectual experience conjointly, taking the world and ourselves into account, we can put the whole thing together and understand how (not *why*, but *how*) we are and do what we consciously are and do. Given this conception, and not without it, we can at any rate express that which it cannot be denied demands expression, the nature of man's reason and man's will, of human progress and human shortcoming, of the effort after good and the failure to gain it, of virtue and vice in their connexion and in their distinction, in their essential opposition and their no less essential unity.¹

It may probably appear to some that in these latter sentences the author is doing with great power that which he has just before pronounced impossible: deducing the truth of the existence of the eternal mind from conceded or established truths of our state. In another place he justly rejects as unreasonable the idea of accounting for the truths of our state and nature by evolution. A true and comprehensive history of our nature would be very welcome. 'But the same cannot be said for a history which should seem to account for it by ignoring its distinctive character, and by deriving it from forms of animal sympathy from which, because they have no element of identity with it, it cannot in the proper sense have been developed.'² The result of the author's investigation of the 'history of the just man's conscience' may be stated in the words, 'It is a history which does not carry us back to anything beyond reason.'³

These are thoughts which it is refreshing to meet in these materialistic days. We can well understand the enthusiasm with which their author was regarded by those who had the happiness of personal intercourse with him. Untimely though his death has been, and grievous though the loss therein to lofty thinking and lofty living in England, yet his friends may reflect with just pride that, even without the further Remains which are promised, this work itself, carefully and lovingly edited as it has been, forms no inadequate result of a thinker's life. We learn from the preface that the book is practically complete. A final revision and the addition of twenty or

¹ *Prolegomena*, p. 180-182.

² *Ibid.* p. 211; see also pp. 215, 217, 219, 247, 260.

³ *Ibid.* p. 231.

thirty,
ceived
from c
assure
powers
would
criticis
may a
studen
views,
not to
lived,
than t
attain

If
with a
and s
promi
taugh
of ma
eterna
show
die to
the tr
book
criter
of ma
desira
this s
lead
find t
truly
perfe
must
is bet

It
life, c
fectio
his fi
spirit
the v
union
us as

thirty pages at the end are all that the work would have received from its author. We need not, therefore, be restrained from criticism by the posthumous character of the book. But assuredly even had the author been alive, respect for his powers and his knowledge and sympathy with his ethical aims would have made us slow to find fault. We desire so to offer our criticism that the most sympathetic reader of the *Prolegomena* may acquit us of captiousness. We but ask the admiring student of Professor Green to consider whether his religious views, being what they were and founded as they were, ought not to have led him, and might not have led him if he had lived, to a more thorough union with the Church of Christ than that which with all his good-will to her he was able to attain.

If other readers feel as we do they will close the *Prolegomena* with a certain disappointment. The principles so carefully and securely laid in the earlier part of the work seemed to promise a moral teaching based upon godliness. We were taught in the outset to regard all the movements of the mind of man as the outcome of the movements of a greater and an eternal mind of which the human is the instrument. We were shown that the mind can never find itself in itself, but must die to live, and lose its individuality in order to possess it in the true sense. But as we approach the conclusion of the book we find our own perfection put before us as the moral criterion. 'Reason gives its own end; the self-conscious spirit of man presents its own perfection to itself as the intrinsically desirable.'¹ And we think it is not sufficiently noticed that this statement of the case requires to be balanced, lest it mislead us to spiritual selfishness. Hegelian principles, which find the truth in contradictions, require us also and just as truly to assert that the self-conscious spirit presents its own perfection as that which is never intrinsically desirable. We must work our own perfection by forgetting it in a service that is better and higher than ourselves.

It is not that Professor Green forgets the claims of social life, or supposes that the individual can pursue his own perfection in isolation from his fellow-men. But, according to his first principles, as we read them, the truest security against spiritual selfishness, that security which lies most deeply in the very nature of the mind itself, is the sense of the divine union with our spirits. No moral motive can lie so close to us as this, nor require such enforcement on the part of any

¹ *Prolegomena*, p. 411.

moral teacher who believes the great truth. And yet, in Professor Green's treatment, the great truth seems as we proceed to become dim and fade away behind the institutions of earthly society; so that we hear more about God in the metaphysical part of the book than we do in the moral: more about God as the guide of human knowledge than of God as the guide of the conscience: a strange reversal of that which we should have looked for.

Hence the differences which the writer lays down between the practical working of his own system and that of utilitarianism are but slight in themselves and stated almost with apology.

'It is satisfactory to acknowledge that the theory of the criterion for which we are arguing does not, for practical purposes, differ much from the utilitarian.'¹ 'To most persons sufficient direction for their pursuits is afforded by claims so well established in conventional morality that they are intuitively recognized, and that a conscience merely responsive to social approbation would reproach us for neglecting them. For all of us it is so in regard to a large part of our lives.'²

Can this ever be the moral condition of one who lives in God?

The insufficient place which the connexion of God with the spirit of man holds in Mr. Green's moral teaching we trace to the imperfect hold which he has upon Christianity as a fact in human history. It is true that throughout his work no word unfriendly to Christianity can be found. On the contrary, there is much which it would seem could not have been written but by a believer. If he lays for Greek philosophy a claim, which history hardly verifies, to the statement of those categories of human virtue which are the forms and moulds that Christianity has filled, he yet allows that it was not till—

'a person had appeared charging himself with the work of establishing a kingdom of God among men, announcing purity of heart as the sole condition of membership of that kingdom, and able to inspire his followers with a belief in the perpetuity of his spiritual presence and work among them, that the time came for the value of the philosopher's work to appear.'³

And we read of the 'voice fitfully heard within man, which gives meaning to the announcement of a perfect life lived for him and somehow to be made his own.'⁴

Still more unreserved is the adoption of Christian ideas

¹ *Prolegomena*, p. 398.

² *Ibid.* p. 307.

³ *Ibid.* p. 427.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 337; see also pp. 311, 327.

in the little work entitled *The Witness of God and Faith*, which has been edited, since the death of Professor Green, by his friend and disciple, Mr. Toynbee—himself, we grieve to say, removed before the book was printed. There the language of S. Paul is adopted, which treats men as ‘ideally the temple of God,’ possessed of ‘the righteousness of God, which is essentially a derived, communicated, and universal righteousness; not of works, but of grace.’ There we are told that he who gains the true wisdom ‘receives Christ as his wisdom, and in the new consciousness thus constituted he is redeemed from the bondage of sin, redeemed from the curse of the law, because he is redeemed from himself.’

The reader who only makes acquaintance with the book through extracts such as these would perhaps hardly guess that its editor states the aim of it to be ‘the separation of the spiritual from the supernatural’; and declares that, ‘while others have assailed the orthodox foundations of religion to overthrow it, Mr. Green assailed them to save it.’

With respect to the former statement we would observe that few have so much reason to object to the misuse of the word supernatural as Christians have. To them it is impossible that the word should have any meaning save that of marking the fact that certain events in their outward form and appearance are different from those which ordinarily happen, and are therefore better fitted to show what the machinery is upon which all events alike depend. They cannot allow that any powers are exerted in miracles other than those which are used in every-day events. So far as the powers exerted are concerned, the lifting of a man’s finger is as supernatural an event as the raising of the dead. And if the exertion of novel powers were the only sense of the supernatural, it might be truly said that Christians do not believe that anything ever happens to which the word supernatural can distinctively be applied. But the word is often, and not unjustly, taken to designate those Powers and that Person, which, while exerted alike in ordinary events and extraordinary, are invisible to man and beyond the outward facts of which he has experience. In this sense of the word every Christian must defend it, but in this sense also there can be no more thoroughgoing maintainer of the supernatural than Professor Green himself. For the very foundation of his system is an elaborate proof that the understanding of man, and, by parity of reasoning, the eternal understanding which that of man reflects, is not from nature but from a higher source. A writer who excepts both God and the human

mind from nature ought certainly to be ranged rather with the supporters than with the opponents of the supernatural.

Accordingly we find other spokesmen of Hegelianism much more guarded upon this point than Mr. Toynbee. We have before quoted the statement of Principal Caird that 'rightly understood, a supernatural Revelation is presupposed in the nature of religion': while as respects Hegel himself, Professor Caird but says that the complete rejection of 'ordinary supernaturalism' is involved in the Hegelian interpretation of Christianity.¹ The significant qualification implied in the word 'ordinary' differences the statement very strongly from Mr. Toynbee's broad assertion.

When the assaults of Professor Green upon the orthodox foundations of Christianity (always presuming that such assaults exist) are contrasted with others as designed to save and not destroy, we gladly allow that the preservation of the moral and even of the spiritual essence of Christianity was most truly the aim of this high-souled man. But it is not in respect of his negative work upon the historic faith that we could allow him any such praise. Mr. Toynbee, when he contrasts the spirit of his friend's assaults with others, appears to have forgotten how commonly negations of the historical forms of Christianity have been accompanied by a show of regard for its spirit, and how little serious meaning the world has attached to such professions.

It is impossible that either Professor Green or his editor should make this profession with greater emphasis than the Hegelian Strauss, whose work upon Christianity the whole world agrees to regard as destructive. Had Professor Green really assailed the orthodox foundations of Christianity, as Strauss in fact did, all the positive religious teaching that he has left would not have hindered the words in which Strauss describes his own position from being an equally exact definition of that of the English Hegelian:—

'My meaning agrees with that deep utterance of Spinoza that "it is by no means necessary to salvation to know Christ after the flesh: but it is otherwise with that Everlasting Son of God, namely the Divine Wisdom which displays itself in all things, but especially in the mind of man, and which displayed itself in a conspicuous manner in Jesus Christ: without this no man can be saved, because it alone can teach what is true and what false, what is good and what evil." As Spinoza, so also Kant, distinguished from the historical Person of Christ that ideal of a humanity pleasing to God, of a morality as pure as it can be in a world dependent on wants and

¹ *Hegel*, p. 92.

desire
this id
repres
tion o
man i
not n
or bel
it as c
This s
result

This,
Green
of Go
what
Spiri
Him

C
thing
unles
All b
to me
fact a
his o
use th
the p
the r
differ
posse
as an
real a

N
repre
tions
of att
period
fessor
Paul
to ma
and I
fectly
delibe
Jesus

desires, which is latent in human Reason. To raise ourselves to this ideal is the universal duty of men : but though we cannot represent this ideal to ourselves otherwise than under the imagination of a perfect man, and though it be not impossible that such a man may have lived, since we all can resemble the idea, yet it is not necessary that we should know of the existence of such a man or believe in it, but only that we keep this ideal before us, recognize it as one which marks our duty, and strive to make ourselves like it. This separation of the historical Christ from the ideal is the inevitable result of the latest developments of the human spirit.¹

This, as we suppose, is exactly the meaning of Professor Green when he writes that 'to say that Christ as the Wisdom of God is an idea or form of intellectual consciousness—and what else can S. Paul mean when he says that Christ is the Spirit which God gives us?—is the very reverse of reducing Him to an impotent abstraction.'²

Certainly to say that Christ or that any other person or thing is an idea is not to reduce Him to an abstraction, unless the idea in question be the idea of an abstraction. All being comes to us as thought ; but if this is to be taken to mean that thinking of a mere thought and thinking of a fact are the same, we shall need to correct Professor Green in his own words :—'The "mere idea" of a hundred thalers, to use the familiar illustration, is no doubt quite different from the possession of them, not because it is unreal, but because the relations which form the real nature of the idea are different from those which form the real nature of the possession.'³ Precisely in the same way the idea of Christ as an ideal is wholly different from the idea of Christ as a real and living possession of mankind.

Nor should the attempt to effect this substitution be represented as an assault merely upon the orthodox foundations of religion, or upon the existing creeds, as if the object of attack were merely a form of religion which came in at a period when the first founders of it had passed away. Professor Green represents himself as holding the belief of S. Paul and S. John in its essence. It is hardly worthy of him to maintain such a paradox. For the conception that Christ and His deeds were not actual facts is one which was perfectly familiar to both S. Paul and S. John, and was by them deliberately rejected :—'Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God : and this is

¹ *Das Leben Jesu für das Deutsche Volk bearbeitet* (Leipzig, 1864), p. 624.

² *Witness of God*, p. 13.

³ *Prolegomena*, p. 27.

that spirit of antichrist.' 'If Christ be not risen, then is your faith vain; ye are yet in your sins.' Yet Professor Green declares that S. Paul 'never appeals to any events in our Lord's life—not even to the resurrection—as evidence in the sense which later theology has attached to the word.'¹ We fear that *his* later theology in propounding a Christianity independent of the evidence of the facts which the New Testament records is rejecting that which the Author and the first preachers of Christianity regarded as essential, if words have any meaning.

Whatever the Hegelian philosophy be, it must, on pain of gross absurdity, recognize some difference between facts and imaginations. Now, it is on the basis of facts and not of imaginations that all the spiritual structure was raised which attracts the admiration of Hegelianism itself: that the Lord said, 'He that saveth his life shall lose it': that S. Paul said, 'All things are yours and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's': and that S. John saw the Divine thought manifesting itself in human life as Truth and Love. It would not be easy to say anything more contrary either to the whole spirit of primitive Christianity or to the special method of the Apostle who declared what he had seen and heard and his hands had handled of the Word of Life, than to say that this very S. John 'took the Person of Christ for ever out of the region of history and of the doubts which surround all past events, to fix it in the purified conscience as the immanent God.'² It is because He is fixed in history as the immanent God that He is fixed as such in the purified conscience. And not one of those great things would have been said or those great lives lived which the Bible records, and which no one better appreciated than Professor Green, if the actors and writers of the Bible had rejected the facts which he would have us reject. It is in the reality of these earthly facts that we find the contest and victory of the life of God, with 'the earnestness, the pain, the labour, the patience involved in the negative aspect of things,' without which, says Hegel himself, it 'is but an edifying truism or even a platitude.'

On what ground is it that these facts are to be rejected? Is it that Hegelianism has pierced so deep into the inward reason and reality of things that it is in a position to reject mysteries? On the contrary, in Hegelianism all is mystery. It gives us no cosmos of experience into which the mysteries and miracles of Christianity do not readily fall. It acknow-

¹ *Witness of God*, p. 57.

² *Ibid.* p. 29.

ledges that it is a question insoluble to us, why God should have subjected the human spirit and His own to the contest and opposition through which alone it realizes itself. But mystery though it be, the whole connexion of God with the world involves for the Hegelian who believes in God a relation in His nature to humanity which may be truly called a tendency towards incarnation. And if this be the mysterious truth in God's whole relation to history, why shrink from the one great Incarnation, in which the tendency reaches its actual embodiment and the realization of union with God is henceforth made an object of men's faith as real?

Because, forsooth, this incarnation is subject to the doubts which surround all past events. We discern, in this objection, an attempt to make religion absolute in a sense which cannot be realized so long as finite beings constitute one of the parties to religion. That in some sense there may be an absolute religion we do not deny. But if religion is to be regarded as existing among men, and as part of their experience, then it is plain that absolute religion is impossible, because the absolute is that which exists out of relation, while religion stands by its name in relation to the nature and life of man. The very beliefs which constitute Hegelian religion in its most sublimated sense—the faith in a Divine Mind and in an ideal humanity—are in their operation upon men subject to contingencies. Whatever root and foundation they have in human nature, we find that men believe them or disbelieve them, just as they do the doctrines of Christianity. They are questions of evidence for and against, and men show themselves quite capable of believing that the evidence is against them. In vain, therefore, do we strain after a religion which shall be the Absolute possession of all men. The very phrase is an inconsistency, for that which is absolute cannot be a possession.

But if we reduce the meaning of our absolute so as to imply only such an absolute as men are capable of grasping, then the Christian Incarnation gives us the absolute religion in the highest degree. And though Professor Green despises the work of the Church in framing her creeds, yet it will be found that in rejecting all compromises and explanation short of the acknowledgment of the Perfect God and Perfect Man, she was holding by the absolute religion whose watchword is 'Die to live.' For the faith that God has given Himself to our nature, and for us, alone recognizes self-surrender as the law of the Divine Mind, while on our part we make a complete surrender of ourselves only when we render

ourselves up to the Lord and to the earnestness, the pain, the labour, the patience of the Cross, in which He found Himself and teaches us to find ourselves. Faith, in the true sense, can be rendered only to the Divine Mind, of which ours is the image and reflection. In Professor Green's use of the word 'faith,' it seems to lose that reference to something beyond ourselves which is its most essential meaning.

A man penetrated as Professor Green seems to have been with a profound belief that the Hegelian system is the deepest truth, metaphysical or moral, to which philosophy can come, must needs admit the utterance which Christianity gives to his principles as evidence of a special work of God; not because the Divine Voice is heard nowhere else, but because Christianity gathers the universal lessons of God to humanity into so concentrated a form. Here we have a Gospel which speaks, not in word only, but in power—that is to say, in reality and in fact. It sets the truth in varied aspects. But there is not one great doctrine of Christianity—the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Sacraments, the life in Christ, the liberty of the Christian or the authority of the Church—which has not its part in making real for man the precept of self-surrender and the gain that comes thereby. Nor is there one of the writers or preachers whose words make up the New Testament—S. Paul, S. James, S. John, or the Lord Himself; or a single constituent part of that book—its history, its letters, or its sermons—that has not a varied, but equally effective, way of enforcing the same great principle.

How, then, shall one who holds with Hegel's philosophy stand in the presence of this unique practical embodiment of his idea, which not only utters it so wondrously, but, what is far more, gives it action and life? Shall he render himself to it with the absolute self-surrender of true faith, and thereby place himself in that reciprocal relation to God which promises never-ending progress in God? or shall he reserve his faith, and maintain himself in his own theories? If he does he never will attain so true a life in death as the historic faith would have given him.

And we shall conclude by offering two instances of this: two cases in which the doctrine of the Church gives to the great Hegelian principle a completer practical exercise than the conception which Professor Green would substitute for it. Both instances are suggested in his own sermons: they are Prayer and the Holy Communion.

In the conclusion of the lay sermon entitled the *Witness of God*, amidst precepts of holiness of the deepest spirituality

and the most searching purity, we find Prayer defined as 'a wish referred to God'; while in the sermon on Faith we are told that—

'In the prayers of the Christian Church, issuing as they do from a consciousness to which the death in Christ to sin and the new life in Him unto God, a free forgiveness, and the indwelling of the Spirit, represented spiritual experiences, we have modes of utterance which in the development of the same consciousness—and it cannot be developed without utterance—we may properly make our own. The fact that others who use them have beliefs as to historical occurrences which we do not share need not prevent us from sharing with them what is not the expression of an historical belief, but a spiritual aspiration.'¹

We prefer the former definition. Prayer is not a mere spiritual aspiration, but a wish referred to God. And it is a wish referred to a God who only requires us to refer our will to Him because He refers His will to us. We cannot think of prayer as an aspiration towards Him without regarding it in its origin as arising in us through union with the God-man whose Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered; and in its effects as drawing a response from Him in default of which He would seem to be remaining in Himself and refusing to give Himself forth to us. And while this response is conditioned by that which Professor Green truly describes as the character of all true good-doing²—namely, the desire to communicate His own good will to us—yet for beings who like us live in the finite, and can receive nothing, even from God himself, except through finite circumstances, it is impossible to think of God as responding to our prayers except through outward as well as inward gifts and providences. The Holy Spirit and the good will which He confers is to be regarded as the one gift which we are sure is always good and always to be given to prayer; but, in subordination and assistance to this, earthly responses of Providence must not be excluded. This is the Church's doctrine of Prayer. An example will serve better to show what we mean than any description. Here, then, is a Christian prayer, written, we need not say, without conscious reference to the theory of Hegelianism:—

'Wherefore, O Lord, when I ask anything of Thee, I design to ask nothing except through Thy Son Jesus Christ and in the union of my own poor will with His most holy desires. The will of Thy most blessed Son, my God, willeth, desireth, demandeth, that I be meek and lowly in heart, patient, kind, full of charity: it desireth

¹ *Witness of God*, pp. 44 and 100.

² *Prolegomena*, p. 262.

that I may live to Thee, die to myself. I pray for the clearest enlightening of mind, chiefly for the knowledge of three things. First, that I may most perfectly learn Thy good pleasure and may entirely perform Thy most holy will. Then, that I may know my own vileness, ingratitude, and unworthiness of all good. Finally, that I may have a perfect knowledge of all moral virtues, and may follow after them: so that the simple, pure, and sincere love of Thee, my God, may more and more prevail in me. Lastly, I beseech Thee that it may please Thee to accept my prayers, not as they come from me, but as inspired by Thee; and to unite them with the prayers of Thy Son Jesus Christ, of His most holy Mother, of the holy Angels, Apostles, martyrs, doctors, virgins, confessors, and of the whole Church, as well militant as triumphant, for the attainment of all those graces and gifts, whether of soul or body, both for myself and for my neighbour. Neither do Thou regard my person, O Lord, but the merits of Jesus Christ Thy Son, from whom every just work and every holy desire doth proceed. All which may it tend to the everlasting glory of the all-glorious Trinity. Amen.¹

Is it such a prayer as this, or the aspiration of an unhelped and solitary soul bent on self-perfection—an aspiration addressed to no responsive ear—which best carries out the principle of surrendering self that we may regain it, which Hegelianism regards as true alike for God and man?

Professor Green recommends his disciples to frequent the Christian ordinances and especially the Holy Eucharist. Can this suggestion be truthfully carried out by one who 'separates the spiritual from the supernatural'? We fear that the attempt would, under these conditions, be so untruthful that a man in making it would be obliged either to accept the supernatural in spite of himself, or else to feel that he was being guilty of a mockery.

But the mind in which the Hegelian communicates, if communicate he does, is described as follows:—

'If we are really seeking to live as members one of another in the general assembly of the first-born, why do we not gladly approach the table where in the simplest of all rites that mutual membership is expressed? We shall not value such expression the less because to us it is only an expression. It is in the hidden life of the Christian society, as we hold—in pureness, in knowledge, in longsuffering, in love unfeigned—that the true table of the Lord is spread and His cup for ever flows. Here is the bloodless altar, the continued sacrifice, because here is the perpetual agapé, the communion of good will. To this spiritual feast, in which the God-man gradually imparts Himself to the soul, the Holy Communion of bread and wine is related as a mode of speech to thought. As seasonable utterance is needed to give strength and definiteness to a thought, to bring it back

¹ *Paradise of the Christian Soul*, edited by Dr. Pusey, p. 237.

to the individual when he has almost lost it, to quicken the consciousness of its being shared by others, so may this ordinance strengthen and refresh the thought of our common spiritual interest in God.¹

The reader who desires on a subject so vital to think and speak with exactness will find some difficulty in making out the precise meaning of these sentences. When the author says that the Holy Communion is related to the true spiritual feast 'as a mode of speech to thought,' the illustration, if it were really only an illustration, might carry the most orthodox meaning. For it might imply that, as speech has thought behind it and puts the hearer in possession of thought, so this visible gift of bread and wine, being not a speech but an actual thing given, has behind it and confers an actual thing really given—namely, 'the God-man.' But while this would be the logical import of the illustration we fear that the context requires us to take the words 'as a mode of speech to thought' to express more than comparison, and nothing less than identity. So that the author's meaning is that, as the receiving of the elements is but an expression, so 'the God-man' is but a thought. But we ask again, what kind of thought? Is it the thought of a reality or is it the thought of a mere idea? The thought of the hundred thalers as really mine, or of the hundred thalers as imagined? To confound these two things is not more surely an offence against the laws of being than it is an offence against the laws of thought.

But if the self-imparting of the God-man means really more than merely the conception in our own minds of an idea of human union: if the 'expression' to which the Holy Eucharist gives utterance be not merely our expression of our thought to ourselves but His expression of His thought to us: then obviously the difficulty, if such it be, of the doctrine of the Real Presence arises under another form. The Hegelian, if he means what he says, recognizes a great and Divine Reality beyond his own nature which in this ordinance imparts itself to him. If he refuses to acknowledge this, what is there for him in the ordinance but a self trying to give itself to a not-self which is but imaginary: and trying to suppose a not-self imparted when it is not imparted and does not even exist?

How much more true is the Catholic doctrine of the Blessed Sacrament to the great principle which is the Hegelian motto! There we have, in that species of thought which is fact and reality, the God-man imparting Himself to our nature. There

¹ *Witness of God*, p. 49.

we have the great ordinance of Sacrifice which has embodied to the human mind in all ages the ideal of Life gained through Death. For the law of the Divine self-sacrifice which was exemplified once for all upon Calvary is here in the progress and development of the Church's life made her own possession, and that of each of her children again and yet again. And the redeemed respond to Him who finds His life in dying for them by offering themselves, their souls and bodies, in Him to the Father. In dying with Him they find their life.

ART. II.—FRAY GERUNDIO—A CLERICAL
DON QUIXOTE.

1. *Historia del Fray Gerundio.* By FRANCIS LOBÀN DE SALAZAR, Minister of the Parish of S. Peter in Villagarcía [Father Joseph Francis Isla, of the Society of Jesus]. Vol. I. (Madrid, 1758.)
2. *The History of the Famous Preacher Friar Gerund de Campazas, otherwise Gerund Zotes.* Translated from the Spanish. In Two Volumes. (London, 1772.)

OF the many readers who enjoy the story of Don Quixote de la Mancha, only a few, probably, realize that it was written for a distinct purpose beyond that of affording amusement. The originality and *naïveté* of the characters draws the attention; the exquisite humour, set off by a simple and pellucid style, retains and delights the mind. That the story is the keenest of satires upon the decaying institutions of chivalry occurs but to comparatively a few readers. Knight-errantry, after long lingering in a world which had outgrown the need of it, has at last disappeared utterly. It was an institution that died hard, partly because it had great traditions and noble memories, and partly also because the combative instinct upon which it was originally planted is one of the permanent forces of human nature. But by the beginning of the seventeenth century, when Cervantes wrote, it had outlived its usefulness, and was altogether out of harmony with the facts of life. When, therefore, Miguel de Cervantes set himself to ridicule the unreality of the chivalric ideal, as it was known in that day, the fantastic point of honour of

the knight himself, the absurd machinery of giants, enchanters, 'gorgons and hydras and chimæras dire,' Dulcineas of marvellous loveliness, to be humbly adored at a far distance, and doughty deeds far surpassing commonplace limits of likelihood, which satisfied well enough the robust appetite for wonders enjoyed by the people in the dark ages, the materials for such a satire lay temptingly before him. Spain was one of the few countries in which the institution still lingered, while yet the public mind was sufficiently detached from it to appreciate the rich vein of absurdity in which its system abounded. A half-century earlier and Spaniards would have felt indignant instead of amused at an attack upon chivalry; while a half-century later the satire would have lost half its force, because of the disappearance of the object aimed at. Coming when it did, however, the mock-heroic epic of Cervantes speedily attained an unexampled popularity. Four editions of it were printed within the first year after its publication (1605)—two at Madrid, one at Valencia, and one at Lisbon. An imitation of it, by some other hand, was published in 1614, even before the second part appeared: two facts which show the great popularity which the work instantly attained. A still more convincing proof of this is the influence it exerted over Spanish literature of its own and subsequent ages. It affected the national mind so powerfully as to become the accepted model for writers who sought popularity, and other publications were cast more or less upon the method of composition which its example afforded.

Such an imitation is the *Historia del Fray Gerundio*. At the distance of more than a hundred years from the publication of *Don Quixote*, it affords so strong a resemblance to the manner of that work that its author was styled the 'modern Cervantes,' and his work 'put upon a par in many respects' with the former. Father Joseph Francis Isla, its putative author, was a Jesuit priest, and wrote *Friar Gerund* under an assumed name, with the laudable intention of correcting the bad style of preaching then prevalent and popular in Spain, by holding up to ridicule those who practised and those who applauded it. Whether under any circumstances a work of that kind could, in any case, have done much towards the accomplishment of his object may be doubted. Probably the public would have laughed over its pages, and still gone on flocking to hear their favourite sermons, by which they were better amused than by any of the public shows. But the fact is that the author's pen was altogether too sharply pointed for his purpose, and it was dipped too frequently in gall. The

ridicule directed upon the peccant preachers cut so deeply as to rouse the offenders to fury. Notwithstanding, therefore, the approbation of the Inquisition, and of several of the most learned of the Spanish clergy, some Orders, especially the Dominican and Mendicant, raised a clamour against the book as soon as it was printed, 'representing to the King that the respect due to the ministers of the Gospel would be too much diminished by such a piece of merciless criticism, and all religious Orders rendered ridiculous in the eyes of the vulgar; the consequence of which would be a relaxation, if not a subversion, of the religion of the country.' Several of the bishops joined in this representation, and the first volume of the book, which was all that was at the time published, was suppressed by the Council of Castile, 'rather,' says Baretta in his *Proposals*, 'for the sake of peace than from any other motive.'

No one likes to be laughed at, and the more lifelike is the caricature the more insufferable is the ridicule. The author knew his models so well, and they were essentially so diverting, that he did not need even materially to exaggerate their peculiarities. Truth unadorned was the fittest for his purpose, because the reality was in itself so exquisitely absurd. The features of Friar Gerund and of Friar Blas, the Predicador Mayor, were of a very familiar type indeed, and needed no heightening; and the whole was set as gravely as possible in a frame of fact and locality so true to the Spain of that day that the vulgar recognized it without difficulty. It would probably be an injustice to the book to call it coarse; but undoubtedly it describes the unrefined manners of remote country districts with more than sufficient plainness; and this ranges sometimes on the confines of coarseness. The general humour of the work is not a little counteracted by frequent dissertations, long and dull, on matters generally trifling, sometimes well-nigh unintelligible. The author lays himself out so laboriously to be continuously humorous that he sometimes tires and vexes his reader; and it is obviously the case that his chief literary talent was the power to describe, with a sort of prosaic accuracy, the people and the manners which were before his eyes. But it is much more the accuracy of a catalogue, or of the photograph, that he displays, than the accuracy of an artist. He, good man, had no faculty for grouping his characters and selecting their surroundings so as to obtain a striking picture, and whatever picturesque scenes his volumes contain are due more to nature than to art—more, that is, to the things described than to any remarkable degree of graphic skill in the describer. But if he is not uni-

formly amusing, it is not for want of huge efforts to be so, or, as he would himself say, from any fault of his own. The description he gives of his hero's birthplace is a piece of very elaborate fooling indeed:—

'Campazas is a place of which Ptolemy has made no mention in his Geography; probably because he had no knowledge of it, owing to its having been founded twelve hundred years after the death of this illustrious geographer, as appears by an ancient instrument preserved in the famous archives of Cotanes. It is situated in the province of Campos, between the west and the north, looking directly towards the east from that part which is opposite to the south. Campazas certainly is not one of the most celebrated or most populous towns of Old Castile; but it might be so, and it is not its own fault that it is not as large as Madrid, Paris, London, or Constantinople, it having been clearly proved that it might have been extended ten or a dozen leagues towards any of the four quarters without any impediment whatever. And if its most renowned founders (whose names are not known), instead of contenting themselves with raising in it twenty or thirty cottages, which by a misnomer they call houses, had been able, and been willing, to build two hundred thousand sumptuous palaces, with their domes and turrets, with squares, fountains, obelisks, and other public edifices, without doubt it might have been at this day the greatest city in the world.'

He continues in this style for six or seven pages, and after a further digression or two arrives at a description of the village where, and the house in which, his hero is to be born, a house distinguished from all the rest in the village as 'being the only one which had a covering of tiles.' One approached it, he continues—

'by a large courtyard, flanked with piazzas, in the language of that country called ox-stalls, outhouses, &c., covered with thatch; and over the door of the house projected a coving in the form of an upper eyelid when it hangs horizontally, well whitewashed on the inside; and being streaked at distances with red ochre, it looked like the skirt of a disciplinant on Maundy-Thursday.'

He has something more to say about 'disciplinants' further on, as we shall see. In this place he rambles on with his story, if that term may be applied when the story makes little progress on account of the innumerable digressions. Chapter ii. is introduced with a marvellous composition, having some resemblance to Latin, which the author entitles a 'Dedication.' He gravely defends it as a very fine composition indeed, and protests that what 'cannot, before God and in conscience, be forgiven' to an assailant vaguely indicated is 'the unjust and insipid criticism which he makes upon the said Dedication, treating it as the most perverse, ridiculous, and extrava-

gant thing imaginable, and adding that the language, though it seems to sound like Latin, is of a barbarous, monstrous, and savage Latinity. But, with leave of his surliness, I shall tell him flatly to his face that he does not know what is your true Latin, and that it is plain he never in his life saluted the Christs in genuine Latinity; for I give him to know that neither Cicero, nor Quintilian, nor Titus Livius, nor Sallust, ever made such a thing, or were ever capable of making it.'

Here, however, is a piece of it for the reader's wonderment. The sly *double entendre* of the last sentence we quoted is fully justified, though we do not suppose that 'this most polished Dedication' is very much worse than a good deal of the jargon of colloquial and even official Latin which did duty in the fifteenth century; and it would not be difficult to pick out of all the Low Latin charters, addresses, &c., to be found in the collections of Isidore and Du Cange parallels to its most barbarous compounds. The originals have *some* meaning, however; the parody seems to dispense with that superfluity:—

'Hactenus me intra vurgam animi litescentis inipitum tua heritudo instar mihi luminis extimandae denormam redubiare compellet sed antistar gerras meas anitas diributa et posartitum nasonem quasi agredula: quibusdam lacunis, baburram stridorem averruncandas oblatero. Vos etiam, optimi viri, ne mihi in anginam vestrae hispiditatis arnanticataclum carmen irreptet. At rabiem meam magicopertit: cicuresque conspice ut alimones meas carnatoreis quam censianes extetis. Igitur conramo sensu meam returem quamvis vasculum Pieridem actutum de vobis lamponem contulam spero.'

After this the father and mother of the hero are introduced; and the author proceeds to explain, with the utmost simplicity, that what is called 'the discipline' was responsible for their marriage. It was, we are to understand, a practice of piety for men to *faire pénitence* on Maundy Thursday, for the sake of mortification; and this practice, which in times of greater religious earnestness may possibly have been productive of nothing adverse to a deepened devotion, either in the actors or spectators of it, had degenerated, at the time to which we are referring, into a rather indelicate stage-play, made use of as a scene of gallantry, so that the author observes, with his habitual simplicity, under which an arch glance is now and then shot, that 'it is a very old observation that the greatest part of the marriages are concerted on Maundy Thursday, the day of the Cross of the May.' Thus he describes with a very apparent amusement:—

'Figure to yourself this disciplinant, with his great cap of five quarters of a yard, starched, upright and pyramidal; his hood

covering the face as well as the head, with the eye-holes neatly stitched, and terminating in a point below his chin like the wattle of a turkey-cock; with his smooth waistcoat of strong linen nicely smoothed, fitted to the shape, and buttoning very tight over the breast, by which two pieces of dry, firm, elevated flesh show themselves out of the two large holes cut in the back of the waistcoat. . . . Then consider that this disciplinant whom we are describing takes out his little ball of wax, stuck with points of glass, and hanging, securely fastened, to the end of a small cord, which he measures with much gravity and composure from his hand to his elbow, in order to have the just length; that he takes hold, with his left hand, of the point of his hood hanging below his chin; that he fixes his right elbow to the hip of the same side (unless, indeed, he be left-handed, and then, it is necessary to observe, all these postures will be directly contrary); that without moving the elbow, and playing only the lower half of his right arm, he begins to work himself with this ball, swinging it on one side and the other, knowing certainly that in this manner it will fall nearly on the central points of the two posterior carnosities, by infallible rules of anatomy left in writing by a young surgeon of Villamayor, who had been apprenticed to another at Villarramiel. Finally, let it be observed how the blood begins to start. . . . Let this object, I say, be contemplated as it deserves, and let the most envious of the glories of Campos tell me serenely if there can be in the world a more gallant and airy spectacle.'

'But I forgot,' as Tristram Shandy observes (much such another bizarre character as our hero), 'all this time *I am not yet born.*' Indeed, our author, occupied by these very interesting observations, which are probably intended to amuse and engage the attention of the reader, gets through a good portion of his first volume before he comes to his hero's birth at all. Born, however, in due time he is; and having had the name of Gerund bestowed upon him, to commemorate the fact that his father, when a boy at school, had for the first and last time in his life taken six places in his class, and that for a *gerund*, proceeds to grow up with all convenient speed. His father was a hospitable man, particularly to the clergy and to friars; and his house was accordingly a favourite place of resort for them, particularly 'those of the begging and messenger kind, the Sabatine preachers,'¹ and those who in time of Lent and Advent went about preaching at the neighbouring market-towns.' These good men, accordingly, would not unfrequently bring out their papers, and rehearse the contents of them at the farm-house table, to the great edification of their gaping country auditory; and this unfortunate circum-

¹ A Sabatine (*Saturday*) preacher is one whose abilities are but small, and who therefore is appointed to preach only on *Saturdays* and other week days, when the congregations are not large.

stance, we are told, must be considered to have given the young Gerund his first unhappy bias to a perverse style of preaching, since he 'took great pleasure in hearing, and afterwards in imitating, them, imprinting most readily on his memory their greatest absurdities, inasmuch that these absurdities only seemed retainable by him, and that, if by miracle any good thing dropped from them, he had not a faculty to take it.' Here the author commences to carry out his professed purpose of holding up to ridicule the stilted and bombastic style of preaching then prevalent. An impartial contempt for propriety, and almost for decency, seems to have marked it throughout. Scraps of threadbare Latin were dragged in perpetually, which had no other than a verbal connexion with the thing treated of: a kind of ponderous punning upon the subject of the discourse was considered exquisite taste, and the most absurd and astonishing doctrinal deductions were made. The object was to *amuse* the audience; the sermon had sunk to be a public show, and edification was the last thing thought of in it. Friars vied with each other in producing the most *outré* 'effects' in the pulpit. A 'father predicador' would dispose himself to preach as a player to make his appearance upon the stage, 'much shaved, much spruced, much *toupéed*; with a glossy cloak, his best habit, plaited skirts; new, nice, curious shoes,' with a handkerchief of some striking colour; 'as if he thought that the delicate spruceness of his person could atone for the filthy grossness of his performance.' Such preachers had no other purpose in their minds during their discourse than 'to solicit applauses, to conquer hearts, and to make money.' They were known 'to make a traffic of their ministry, to preach for interest, and to canvass and bustle for functions¹ of the greatest pay!'

Accordingly the grossest ignorance in necessary matters of fact, and of the subjects even of their sermons, was to be observed in preachers of this class.

'It often happens that he who has the least knowledge of the saint that is preached upon is the very preacher himself, making it his pride to take such abstracted subjects that one and the same sermon may serve for S. Liborius, for S. Roque, for S. Cosmo, for S. Damian, for the Virgin of Sorrows, and, upon a pinch, for the Blessed Souls in Purgatory.'

They strove by any and by all means to make a sensation, though it were a ludicrous one, and by acting as jesters to astonish, at all events, and divert the audience, if they could

¹ *I.e.* sermons.

not edify them. Here, for example, is a sketch of a sermon for All Souls' Day:—

'Fire! fire! fire! The house is on fire! *Domus mea domus orationis vocabitur.* Now, sexton, touch the loud-sounding bells. *In cymbalis bene sonantibus.* Do it so; for to toll for the dead and to toll for fire is the same thing, as the judicious Picinelus remarks: *Lazarus amicus noster dormit.* Water, sirs, water! for the world is burning: *quis dabit capiti meo aquam?* the interlineal, *qui erant in hoc mundo*; Pagninus, *et mundus eum non cognovit.* But what do I see? Alas! Christians. The souls of the faithful are in flames! *Fidelium animæ!* and the voracious element feeds on flowing pitch. *Requiescant in pace, id est, in pice,* as Vatablus explains it. Fire of God, how it burns! *ignis a Deo illatus.* But now rejoice with me; for, behold, there descends the Virgin del Carmen to deliver those who have worn her holy scapularies; *scapulis suis.* "Let justice be done," says Christ. "Mercy defend us!" says the Virgin. *Ave Maria.*'

It will probably be thought that the 'Father ex-Provincial's' estimate of such productions was not at all overcharged—

'that his style, instead of being an elevated one, was nothing but a swoln, bombastical, sesquipedalian rant, made up of leaves without any fruit; that his affected cadences are as inconsistent with good prose as full and numerous sentences, but void of measure, are to good verse; that this kind of style causes laughter, or rather loathing, to those who know how to speak and write; that the expressions which are called lively were only of noise and bawling; that such a method of feeling and expressing the affections was that which is proper rather to a player than a preacher, laudable on the stage, but insufferable in the pulpit; that the objections were such as would never enter into any but his own idle head, and the solutions of them as arbitrary as futile; that the thoughts were all to be reduced to little, colloquial, juvenile sayings, jingling and playing upon words, and poetical conceits without marrow or solidity; that in all the sermon there was not to be discovered a grain of oratorical salt, as it had not the most distant appearance of a methodical and arranged discourse, nothing of a concatenation, nothing of connexion, nothing of ratiocination, nothing of the pathetic: in short, that it was an untied besom, a parcel of little quaint conceits spread abroad, trifling thoughts scattered here and there, and this was the sum and substance of the whole business.'

But we are to understand, nevertheless, that this kind of preaching was excessively popular. An offender of this kind is represented as saying, 'I see that I attain [applause] by the means I use; for I likewise make a noise in the world: I am followed, I am applauded, I am admired.'

Among such a kind of preachers Father Isla makes his

hero's boyhood to be spent, as if to account in the most natural manner for the results which followed. Nor was Gerundio less unfortunate in his schoolmasters. The first had a quaint notion that, in writing, a small thing should always be written with a small letter, and a great conception with a great letter:—

‘For instance, can anything be more impertinent than, speaking of a Leg of Beef, to write it with an *l* as small as if I was speaking of the *leg* of a lark; or, when treating of a Mountain, to make use of such a little scoundrel *m* as if I was talking of a mouse? This is not to be borne, and has been a most gross and fatal inadvertency in all who hitherto have written. A pleasant thing indeed, or, to speak properly, most ridiculous, to equal Zaccheus in the *Z* with Zabulon and with Zorobabel! The first, it is plain from Scripture, was a little tiny fellow, almost a dwarf, and the two others any person of judgment conceives to be at least as great and corpulent as the biggest giant on the Day of Corpus. And to think that they did not fill as much space of air as they fill of the mouth, *proportione servata*, is an idle story. Now behold: let zaccheus and Zabulon go forth on paper, and being or having been so unequal in their bulk, is it just, is it reasonable, they appear equal in the writing? It can never be; ’tis most highly ridiculous.’

Nor was the next preceptor to whose care he was assigned any less odd. ‘His conversation,’ observes the author, ‘was inlaid work of Latin upon Spanish, quoting at every turn sayings, sentences, hemistichs, and whole verses of the ancient and modern Latin poets, orators, historians, and grammarians, in support of any nonsensical position.’

And this worthy doctor had not one but entire shoals of odd notions, every one of which he transferred to the too willing brain of his pupil. His discourse bristles with paradoxes even when the sentiments are in themselves unexceptionable. Here, for example, where he is enunciating the excellent rule that praise to the living is dangerous:—

“*Non laudes hominem in vitâ sua, lauda post mortem*,” said the Domine gravely: “these are the words of the Holy Spirit; but the heathen poet hath better said—

‘*Post fatum laudare decet, dum gloria certa.*’

“Better than the Holy Spirit, sir?” asked Anthony in a fright. “What! are you scandalized at this, sir?” said the Domine. “How often must you have heard in the very pulpit, from preachers who soar out of sight, ‘Thus says the royal prophet, thus Jeremiah, thus Paul, but I say it in another manner.’ What is this but to tell us, ‘I say it better’? *Præterquam quod*, I do not assert that the saying is better, but that it is better said, because the words of the Holy Scripture are but little suitable to confirm the rules of grammar,

verba sacra scripturae grammaticis exemplis confirmandis parum sunt idonea."

The youth Gerund would have been very much 'out of keeping' with the gallery of originals which our author has here represented, had he not shown himself in due time a veritable pickle. The author ironically compliments him :—

'Do not suppose that our Gerund was wont to stand turning his head idly from side to side like a weather-cock, or to be pulling the boy who stood before him by the cloak, or moistening the end of a straw to lay it gently in the ear of the said boy, or to tickle his neck with it, as if it had been a fly ; nor much less to be entertaining himself in making a sort of chain-work with the remaining part of the lace with which his waistcoat was drawn together before, and when it was all involved in this chain-work giving it a pull by the end and undoing it at once : all these tricks, with which boys usually beguile their time at church, he was much scandalized at, and consequently shunned the practice of. No ; motionless did our Gerund always stand, with his face reverently towards the altar, and his eyes nailed on an *Æsop's Fables* in his hand, which he construed over and over with the greatest devotion.'

He is enticed into becoming a monk, at length, by stories that 'neither king nor the Pope lived a better, at least not more happy,' life. The licence and laxity then and for long after prevailing in the religious houses of Spain are effectively held up to censure in the sketches of this part of the book. Admitted, then, into the monastery, Friar Gerund did not fail to keep up his school reputation as a scapegrace. Anything more contrary to the conventional idea of a religious house cannot be conceived ; and we must suppose our author to be here intimating his opinion that things had very much run to seed in the Spanish monasteries of his day :—

'The master of the novices was a good soul, devout and pious to the last degree, and equally candid and simple. If he saw a novice go with downcast eyes, with his hood pulled over his head, his hands under his scapulary, of a sneaking gait, and creeping always under the wall, punctual in all the acts of the community, silent, devout, and even in his recreations speaking always of God and Christ—but what if he was naturally modest and ingenuous ? If he asked his leave to inflict upon himself extraordinary penances and mortifications, though he never did them ? If he was for ever running to him to communicate his spiritual concerns, and give him account of his feelings and experiences in the mental prayer or meditation that was enjoined him, especially if there was anything which smelt of imaginary vision ? If, above all, he came with a tone of charity, scrupulousness, and zeal to tell him of the faults he had remarked, which perhaps his malice only had the ingenuity to dis-

cover, in his companions? 'Twas enough, 'twas abundant; the good master could require no more; he could believe no ill of such a novice, though declared to him by the barefooted friars themselves; and if anyone accused him of any little trespass he would place it to the account of envy or emulation, saying, with almost tears in his eyes, that virtue, Divine virtue, was persecuted in the very cloisters. The rogues of novices, though for the most part but mere boys, were cunning enough to see this weakness or goodness of their master, and of course the most artful cheated him into the belief of their being the greatest saints. Our Gerund was not behindhand with the slyest fox of them all, but rather exceeded them in playing his part in this farce.

The reader must imagine a noviciate so promising to have been approved by all who had to judge of it, and Friar Gerund, without study (for he 'had imbibed the utmost horror for all scholastic studies, to which he could not be brought to apply, neither by private admonition nor public reprehension, neither by confinement to bread and water, by discipline, nor by any other chastisements of holy use in the community'), to have bloomed into a preacher, as much applauded, caressed, and run after as his great model, the 'Father Predicador Mayor' himself. In this latter no less than in Gerund the prevailing faults of the Spanish pulpit were held up in the gravest manner to the view of the reader. It is he whose example and instructions, more than any other cause, confirm Gerund in the vicious style of preaching which he himself practised. He is introduced as giving his too willing pupil four rules for writing sermons, which embody what is most objectionable in his practice:—

'The first rule: The choice of books. Every good preacher should have in his cell, or at least in the library of his convent, the following books: the Bible, Concordance, *Polianthea* or *Theatrum Vite Humane* of Beyerlink, *Theatre of the Gods, Fasti* by Musculus or *Pagan Kalendar* of Mafejan, *Mythology* of Natalis Comes, Aulus Gellius, *Symbolical World* of Picinelus, and above all the poets Virgil, Ovid, Martial, Catullus, and Horace. As to sermons, there is need only of the *Florilegium Sacrum*, which is in itself an India. There is no occasion for any editions of the fathers or expositors. Whenever thou wouldst support any position or thought of thy own by the authority of any holy father, say roundly at once, Thus says the Eagle of Doctors, thus the Golden Mouth, thus the Honeycomb of Milan, thus the Oracle of Seleucia; and put in the mouth of S. Augustine, S. John Chrysostom, S. Ambrose, or S. Basil, whatever thou hast a mind, for these two reasons: first, because no one will go to look for and compare the citation; secondly, because though what thou sayest never entered into the heads of the holy fathers, yet it might have entered them. As to expositors, never mind

them
most
they
orde
thy
them
nece
holy
the
disc

som
quib
brist
cad

fol

fath
thin
Ang
S.
Am
Tia
you
too
Sab
Ev
som
ex

ow

aut
me
in
me
wa
for
tai

wi
it
T

them; but expound thou the Scripture as thou pleasest, or as it turns most to account, for thou hast as much authority to interpret it as they. . . . Because I know it is necessary to cite many expositors in order to appear a well-read and Scriptural man, I would not prevent thy citing them whenever thou pleasest. I rather advise thee to cite them by wholesale; but in order to cite them it is by no means necessary to read them, and therefore do by them as thou dost by the holy fathers; father on them whatever thou wilt, taking great care that the Latin has no solecisms in it, and my word for it they will never discover the bastardy to thy face. . . .

'The third rule: Let the title or subject of the sermon be always something jocular, or sonorous, or professional, or theatrical, or quibbling.

'The fourth rule: Let thy style be always pompous, swollen, bristling with Greek or Latin, altisonant, and with as graceful a cadence as possible.'

And so on, with examples *ad libitum*.

Those who are not weary already of these varieties of folly may like to have some further specimens:—

'He was one of those polite preachers who never cite the holy fathers, nor even the sacred Evangelists, by their proper names, thinking that this is vulgar. S. Matthew he called *the Historian Angel*, S. Mark *the Evangelic Bull*, S. Luke *the most Divine Brush*, S. John *the Eagle of Patmos*, S. Jerome *the Purple of Belen*, S. Ambrose *the Honeycomb of Doctors*, and S. Gregory *the Allegorical Tiara*. It is not to be supposed that in naming a text he would tell you simply and naturally the Gospel and chapter from whence he took it. No; that he thought was enough to brand him for a Sabatine preacher. It was well known that he would always say, "*Ex Evangelica lectione Matthæi vel Johannis capite quarto-decimo*," and sometimes, for a more sonorous collocation of words, "*quarto-decimo ex capite*."

The following wonderful effusion is from Friar Gerund's own sermon of S. Ann's Day:—

'Ann, as we all know, was the mother of our Lady, and grave authors affirm that she carried her in her womb twenty months, "*Hic mensis sextus est illi*;" and others add that she wept, "*Plorans ploravit in noctem*"; whence I infer that Mary was a *Zahori*,¹ "*Et gratia ejus in me vacua non fuit*." But let the orator attend to argument. S. Ann was the mother of Mary, but Mary was the mother of Christ; therefore S. Ann is the grandmother of the most Holy Trinity, "*Et Trinitatem in unitate veneremur*." On this account is she celebrated in

¹ There was a popular idea in Spain that some persons were born with a power of seeing clearly anything that was covered, even although it were buried in the earth, so that it were not covered with a blue cloth. These were called *zahoris*, i.e. *clairvoyants*.

this her house, "*Hæc requies mea in sæculum sæculi.*" And what can be given thee, O Ann, in retribution for thy compendious benefits? "*Quid retribuam Domino?*" What parallels can express my words in the speaking thy praises? "*Laudo vos? In hoc non laudo.*" Thou art that mysterious net in whose opaque meshes remain captivated the silly fishes. "*Sagenæ missæ in mari.*" Thou art that stone of the desert which the lover of Rachel erected in the Damascan field to give water to his flock. "*Mulier, da mihi aquam.*" But I shall say better, following the text of the Gospel, S. Ann is that precious pearl which, fecundated by the insults of the horizon, makes those who seek it blind, "*Querentibus bonas margaritas.*" She is that treasure, now hidden, *thesaurus absconditus*, now occult, *nihil occultum*, which the holy soul reserved for the utmost ends of the earth, "*De ultimis finibus pretium ejus.*" She is that hidden God, as Philo said, "*Tuus Deus absconditus*"; and she is the greatest of miracles, as Thomas said, "*Miraculorum ab ipso factorum maximum.*"

Of course Gerund's superiors were divided between amusement at his extravagances and concern for the misuse made of a serious function, as his inferiors were lost in admiration of the sermon as 'a most valiant performance.' 'The absurdities which he strings together,' said the former, 'are insufferable, and are all owing, first, to the want of study, and secondly to the muddy fountains at which he drinks, or the accursed models he proposes for his imitation, than which there cannot be worse either in mode or substance.' And endeavours were made, accordingly, to induce Gerund to change his style of preaching; but he proved unexpectedly obstinate, and at length declared roundly to the head of his monastery, 'If this be to preach ill, and in a bad style, I must tell your Paternity very plainly that I never think of preaching in any other style, or any other manner, as long as God shall grant me the use of my understanding'—a declaration for the boldness of which he had like to have been put in the dungeon of the convent. Nor did a certain Beneficiary succeed any better in the endeavour to induce him to apply himself in some degree to necessary studies:—

'Gerund tells him, with great candour and coolness, that God never intended him for a professor's chair, but for the pulpit, and that he will as much apply to scholastic studies as it now rains pack-saddles. To which the Beneficiary replies that if it should rain pack-saddles everyone would be ill spent which did not fall upon the back of such an ass as his worship, and takes his leave.'

Gerund then holds on his way throughout the rest of this volume and the whole of the next; and it conducts him through a variety of adventures, some grave and some gay

but all
present
for its
trates,
another
in the
in its
heroic
popula
flavour
the fo
fully a
mirth

By
preach
what
depen
mean
happo
neces
not d
rience
They
often
Now
the v
in pr
outbr
prese
(and
Arm
this
verac
to ha

but all amusing. Like its prototype, *Don Quixote*, the story preserves the reader's liking, and even a measure of respect, for its hero, notwithstanding the succession of follies he perpetrates, and which place him in one ridiculous situation after another. In freshness of tone, natural and simple incident, and in the number and novelty of the types of character described in its pages, it is no unworthy successor of the great mock-heroic romance of Cervantes. But it has this drawback to popularity among the general public, that a professional flavour pervades its humour. The depth of its incongruities, the force of its irony, the *sal Atticum* of its sarcasm, can be fully appreciated only by the clergy, though there is enough mirth even on the surface to delight the general reader.

But its special purpose of scourging faulty methods of preaching, and of instructing both congregations and preachers what are the conditions and qualities upon which goodness depends in discourses to be spoken from the pulpit, is by no means even now obsolete. It is not every oration that happens to hit the popular fancy of the moment that is necessarily excellent in itself. Average congregations are not discriminating in the matter of sermons, and our experience is that they have, as a rule, rather bad taste than good. They know, as people commonly say, what they 'like,' and very often they see little more deeply into the matter than that. Now *Gerund* is a very *malleus prædicatorum* for the silly, the vulgar, the pretentious, the tawdry, and the profane style in preaching. If England should ever be threatened with an outbreak of so-called 'popular' preaching marred by the presence of any or all of these qualities in unbearable degree (and some recent displays in connexion with the Salvation Army and similar organizations have seemed to show that this is by no means a very remote possibility), then this veracious history of Friar Gerund may prove even now not to have outlived its usefulness.

ART. III.—THE CREED AS THE BASIS OF APOLOGY.

The Historic Faith. Short Lectures on the Apostles' Creed.
By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, D.D., D.C.L., Regius
Professor of Divinity and Fellow of King's College,
Cambridge. (London and Cambridge, 1883).

AT certain periods of Church history almost all the energies of theological writers seem to be turned into the direction of apology. Whether it be that the attacks of infidelity at times grow stronger, or that the capacity for original and constructive theological work grows weaker, and therefore men fall back upon the easier and secondary task of defence, or that the Church is brought at times into fresh contact with the world, and has therefore to justify herself afresh, it is difficult to say; but from some cause or other it is plain that every now and then the literature of Christianity becomes mainly, or at least very greatly, apologetic. Such a period was the second and third quarters of the second century—the age of Justin Martyr—when the first impulse derived from living contact with the Apostles was dying away, and the spread of the Church was attracting the attention of opponents. Another such period was the earlier half of last century, when English Deism was opposed and finally silenced by the apologetic writings of Butler and Warburton, of Berkeley and Bentley, and pure theology seemed almost to have perished with the Stuart dynasty. Such a period, again, is that in which we are now living: the great dogmatic works of the Tractarian movement have given place to apologetic writings of every kind; and historical and literary criticism on the one hand, and philosophical and scientific attacks on the other, call away the best energies of many divines from the more original and profound work of theology.

But in these similar periods of apologetic activity a great difference of method and tone is apparent. The earliest apology was not so much a defence against special and direct attacks as the presentation of the Christian faith in such a form as to commend it to ignorant or prejudiced readers, and therefore these writings have been not only effectual for their proper object, but also of permanent value as theological treatises. The opponents of English Deism also, at least so far as Butler may be taken as their representative, though

their
versy
only
apolo
differ
of dat
effecti
of the
than l
detail
to pro
Churc
getic
imme
critici
will r
itself,
Light
hypot
from
in the
religio
take u
them
aspec
metho
Volta
move
of de
theori
dictio
again
doubt
the o
and h
half-e
the ei
for th
most
learn
hensi
check
logica
with
ment

their work was more strictly defensive, conducted the controversy in a broader way than is now common ; they left us, not only answers to particular objections, but also a method of apology which has shown itself capable of adaptation to very different controversies and attacks. The *Analogy* is almost out of date in its details ; in its method it is more valuable and effective than ever. It seems, on the contrary, that the apologies of the present day are rather answers to particular objections than broad statements of Christian truth ; their strength is in detail rather than in method ; and, therefore, they are likely to prove rather ephemeral than permanently valuable to the Church. In one department only has our age produced apologetic work which is more than defensive, greater than its immediate object, and that is in the department of history and criticism. Here method has opposed method, and the victory will remain, we are persuaded, if it has not already declared itself, with the inductive and truly historical method of Bishop Lightfoot and Dr. Westcott, and not with the *à priori* and hypothetical method which Baur and Hilgenfeld inherited from Strauss and Hegel. But we cannot help thinking that in the scientific and philosophical controversies concerning religion the defenders are too apt to be purely defensive, to take up separate arguments as they occur, and to deal with them independently, without sufficient regard to the general aspect of the question, and without following any one definite method of defence. It should be remembered that, unlike the Voltairean attack of last century, the present anti-Christian movement is essentially a matter of general principles, not of details. We have to deal with broad and comprehensive theories, not with small cavillings at dates and verbal contradictions, when we confront evolution, or defend our faith against the generalizations of 'comparative religion.' No doubt, and this is one of the great difficulties of the position, the old form of attack continues among the half-educated, and has to be met by those who are called upon to teach the half-educated. Mr. Bradlaugh's type of infidelity is that of the eighteenth century, and it has obviously great attractions for the working classes. The most elaborate analogies, the most profound re-statements of Christian truth, the most learned historical defences of the Gospels, the most comprehensive apologetic methods are liable to be outflanked and checked by some ridiculously minute verbal difficulty or logical quibble. The lecturer on Christian evidences must, with a working-class audience, be prepared to face the momentous question, How did Cain get a wife ? before he can

get a hearing for his answers to Huxley or Renan. But, in spite of this survival and overlapping of obsolete objections, it is certain that the chief controversies of the present day are not concerned with such details, but are based upon vast and comprehensive theories of the world and of life, which require to be met by similar systematic statements of truth, in addition to the detailed defences of special points. In our day the parts have been reversed. In the last century it was the enemy that forgot that Christianity was a system, and contented himself with picking at details; but now our opponents present us with a system, a complete *Weltanschauung*, and we too often think we have done enough when we have refuted some minor objections or established some insignificant coincidences. Even when the answer is, as it often is, crushing and complete, the mere fact that by the nature of the case it is only one of a series, prevents us from seeing the full strength of the position. For instance, the able discussion of the infidel arguments against the truth of the Resurrection in M. Godet's *Defence of the Christian Faith* leaves us, in spite of the overwhelming force of the answer to each separate objection, with a dim uneasiness and uncertainty, a vague idea that of so many objections some must be true; for in dealing with them *seriatim*, we are apt to forget the answers to those that have gone before, and what is more, we do not notice that many of these objections refute each other. We feel the want of a master-key, so to speak, which will open all locks; we wish to fall back upon some comprehensive principle such as that of analogy as Butler understood it; and no amount of successful refutation of separate objections will make up for this deficiency.

But this sort of apology has a more serious fault. Theologians should always bear in mind the necessity—we will not shrink from the old-fashioned conventional phrase—of edification. There is an intellectual interest, not to say amusement, in religious controversy which will generally win for it readers who are by no means distinguished for earnestness or piety; and the more detailed the controversy, the more does it appeal, now to the scholar, now to the historian, now to the man of science. Apologetic works of this kind generally contain something to interest every class of reader; but the uninstructed Christian will not often find in them the means of acquiring a knowledge of the system of his religion. He is more likely to carry away the idea that theology is a sort of intellectual tournament, in which victory remains with the most agile combatant. But, says the apologist, my book

is not
give th
my ob
the im
schem
of Chr
is a f
πίστε
may c
a step
unnec
to hav
were
main
chara
force
of pa
the C
know
separ
hostil
on its
organ
whol
taken
often
attac
persu
syste
A
apolo
matio
versi
tone
com
assu
indiv
in a
cast
this
taug
cont
pha
theo
in f

is not intended for this purpose of edification ; others will give the student a complete view of the Christian system ; my object is to defend religion from attack. But this is just the important question. There is, doubtless, room for such a scheme of defence ; but is it not likely that the best defence of Christianity is Christianity itself, and that the true apology is a full and connected presentation of the *ἀναλογία τῆς πίστεως* ? Conviction is not faith ; and though controversy may convince, it cannot produce faith, and rarely even forms a stepping-stone to faith. We do not say that controversy is unnecessary ; it was necessary for the rebuilders of Jerusalem to have weapons in their hands, but that was because they were working at the wall. Enemies must be repelled, but the main work of edification must not be lost sight of. And the characteristic difficulties of our time do not arise from the force of particular objections, but from the superior attraction of pantheistic or secularist systems, because in many cases the Christian system is ignored or misunderstood. Men only know Christianity as it is attacked and as it is defended, in separate and unconnected details, not as it ought to confront hostile systems, and as alone it can carry its divine authority on its face—in its full proportions and vital cohesion as an organic system of living truth, with parts dependent on the whole, with details and separate fragments built together and taken up into the one great edifice. Modern apology too often fails even to convince, because it forgets that it is attacking a system ; and it still oftener fails to attract and persuade, because it seems to forget that it is defending a system.

A further result of this purely defensive attitude of modern apology is that there is a want of harmony between the dogmatic and the apologetic theology of the day. The controversial tone is that of the nineteenth century ; the dogmatic tone is that of the sixteenth. Apologetic writers have been compelled, for the most part, to reconsider many of the old assumptions, to give up many exaggerations, to discard as indifferent many doctrines that once were thought essential ; in an unsystematic and piecemeal way they have been recasting the form and outline of theology. But very little of this change has taken place in dogmatic theology, as it is taught and preached. In all kinds of religious instruction old controversies which have dropped out of men's minds are emphasized and brought forward ; while in many a sermon, theories, such as that of verbal inspiration, are assumed, which, in face of infidel attacks, are all but universally abandoned.

Many must have felt it difficult to give apologetic books to the young, because of the shock which this sort of discrepancy must cause. The sixth-form boy, whose religious teaching has been confined to his Bible lessons and his preparation for confirmation, will find with astonishment, when he begins to study the evidences of Christianity, that the Bible is not held to be verbally inspired, sometimes not even finally authoritative, and that many of the doctrinal statements of the Catechism and Articles are, if not totally ignored, at least very strangely transformed. The result is very often either a vague idea that theologians are ready to give up any article of faith when they find it attacked by science, or a gross misconception of the real contents of the Christian belief. The obsolete phraseology and the false and one-sided theology of many religious manuals are responsible for more infidelity than can be estimated.

The causes of this discrepancy between apologetic and dogmatic theology seem to us to be two. In the first place, apologists have effected this recasting of theology in such a piecemeal way that they themselves, and still more their readers, scarcely realize the extent to which it has gone. A concession has been made here, a tacit assumption has been tacitly given up there, this or that text has been re-translated or differently understood; but these things have been done at various times and by various writers, so that the change as a whole is very rarely perceived. Nevertheless its influence is affecting very profoundly the whole tone of thought on these subjects, and men feel the change, but feel it vaguely and obscurely; they can hardly point out the actual alterations that their faith has undergone. In the second place, the study of dogmatic theology has not kept pace with that of apologetics, so that we have very few dogmatic works written from the point of view of our time, impregnated with the scientific and historical spirit of the age, fully conversant with the latest philosophical postulates, and yet animated by a firm belief in the whole system of Christianity, and a perception of the relative proportion and connexion of religious truths. Theology is, or ought to be, the queen of sciences; she ought to be able to accept and assimilate whatever fresh truths science and civilization together reveal, and she ought to do this by showing how her own system is co-extensive with human thought, answers to every deepest need of the human soul, and exercises authority over every development of human life. As it is we do not know where we stand. We do not know with accuracy what the atti-

tude of
spirits
blindly
sophy
problem
fashion
relativ
be do
inquir
menta
prima
relativ
time.
contes
such
would
modifi
a real
all co
it wo
doing
agnos
T
task;
Engli
West
critic
with
and s
les d
mind
nearl
whol
whor
apolo
that
head
fault
desig
tive
Cree
out o
shor
of ev
ungr

tude of theology is in regard to much that the modern spirit is producing. Some would have us accept almost blindly whatever is asserted or assumed by science or philosophy; some would have us reject it as blindly. The problem cannot be solved in any such rough and ready fashion; there is no infallible formula for determining the relation of Christianity to modern thought. But much could be done, and much help could be given to anxious and inquiring minds, by a comprehensive exposition of the fundamental truths of Christianity, which should deal with them primarily in their relation to each other, secondarily in their relation to the scientific and philosophical principles of our time. The elements of this work lie scattered about in contemporary books, sermons, articles, even poems; but in such shapes they are almost useless to the student, and it would need a master hand to gather together, and select, and modify, and improve these fragmentary hints, so as to produce a real apology. For though such a work would be hardly at all controversial, it would be in the truest sense apologetic; it would both justify and explain Christianity, and by so doing it would refute, or still better forestall, the theories of agnosticism and secularism.

There are few men living who could undertake such a task; but we imagine those who are acquainted with modern English theology would not hesitate to acknowledge Dr. Westcott as one of those few. He combines a profound critical and historical knowledge of the sources of Christianity with a quick and sympathetic appreciation of the philosophical and scientific ideas of the present day. He has, of course, *les défauts de ses qualités*; it is hard for so sympathetic a mind to resist a tendency to vagueness in its desire to include nearly all forms of thought in the same creed. But, on the whole, we should look to him as almost the first of those from whom a worthy attempt at what we may call constructive apology might be expected, and it was with this expectation that we took up his latest work, of which the title stands at the head of this article. That we have been disappointed is not the fault of Dr. Westcott, but rather of our own expectations. His design in this series of lectures was not to furnish an exhaustive manual of theology, but a popular exposition of the Creed, suggestive and often profound, but not fully worked out or complete. It is, of course, impossible in a series of short lectures to give an adequate explanation and illustration of even the chief articles of the Creed, and it would be most ungrateful to ignore the value of what Dr. Westcott has ac-

completed within the limits he has chosen. As he says in the preface, we believe it will be the case that 'anyone who wishes to follow out in detail the topics which are touched upon will find that the arrangement which has been followed will give a convenient outline for study.' And in the notes Dr. Westcott has examined the Biblical statements of some of the doctrines of Christianity with great thoroughness, as well as suggestiveness, covering thereby part of the ground which must be occupied by any true apology. One especially valuable note on the Blood of Christ is taken from Dr. Westcott's lately-published commentary on S. John's Epistles. We find also in this little book all the qualities which the author's more elaborate works have led us to look for: conscientiousness, sympathy, depth, a lofty moral tone, a profound sense of the bearing of truth upon life, and a power of summing up and enshrining a whole region of thought in one pregnant sentence. In this last quality Dr. Westcott at times reminds us of S. Augustine, so weighty and terse and earnest are his phrases. Thus he sums up the New Testament teaching on eternal life as 'a life in which there is *the unity of infinite peace and the energy of infinite love*'; he declares that the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body 'substitutes for the monotony of continuance the vision of being infinitely ennobled,' and 'preserves the chastening thought that we may enter into life incomplete and maimed, if powers of vision or action or movement . . . *have been lost because they were not consecrated*'; and he thus marks the distinction between the Old and the New Testament revelation of the Spirit: 'Holiness was seen as the attribute of a Divine Ruler, and not as the essence of a Divine Sanctifier.'

But the chief importance of the book, to our mind, lies in its scope and method. Dr. Westcott has indicated the way in which the wants of the present day may best be satisfied. As we have said, inquiring minds are demanding a system, not fragments; positive truth, not defensive refutations of scepticism; modern and living phraseology, not scholastic and obsolete formulæ. These formulæ, as every theologian knows, are invaluable in their place; they represent the wisdom and learning of the best ages of theology; but they need to be translated into terms of modern thought, if they are to be fruitful in modern controversies. To do all this, what we have called constructive apology is necessary, and we believe that Dr. Westcott's popular sketch of such an apology is an attempt in the right direction. It should be based upon the condensed summaries of Biblical teaching which the Church

has
and
mod
the
hist
Life
able
be
ceas
I
tryin
ways
state
been
Chri
have
misr
call
great
Pilg
doctr
ampl
punis
truth
made
who
educ
the C
and f
is de
dogm
again
trine
fount
of va
unfor
nents
Bible
is us
it. I
which
We
Chris
Bible
trinsi
VO

has transmitted to us in the Creeds ; it should be thoroughly and impartially Scriptural in its matter, while fearlessly modern in its manner and tone ; it should be, and, if based on the Creeds, it must necessarily be, historical as our Faith is historical : that is, the central point must be the historical Life of Christ. We sincerely hope that Dr. Westcott may be able to undertake some such work ; no greater service could be rendered to the Church in these days of anxious, unceasing, all-pervading doubt and controversy.

It seems to us that in the sort of treatise we have been trying to describe each truth should be dealt with in three ways. The first requisite is that the doctrine itself should be stated clearly, fully, and, above all, accurately. As has often been said, infidelity more frequently arises from ignorance of Christianity than from any other cause ; and a great step will have been taken when the ground has been cleared of the misrepresentations and misconceptions of what is sometimes called the popular theology, which are often founded upon great, but not authoritative, writings like *Paradise Lost* or the *Pilgrim's Progress*, and are perpetuated by the remarkable doctrinal statements of the ordinary hymnologies. For example, the whole doctrine of the future life and of future punishment would gain in consistency and clearness were the truth as to the Intermediate State more often taught and made prominent ; and many other instances will occur to any who are conversant with the theological opinions of even well-educated persons. A clear and complete statement of what the Church actually holds on any subject, freed from Romish and from Puritan accretions, with a definite line between what is *de fide* and what is only speculative, is the first essential in dogmatic apology. But there is a danger to be guarded against in this respect. It is necessary to deduce our doctrines from the Bible, to refer them at every step to their fountain head, to check them by an exhaustive comparison of various passages ; but for the proof of doctrine we have unfortunately reached a time when, in presence of our opponents, we are no longer able to appeal to the Bible. The Bible itself has to be proved and supported by argument. It is useless to bewail this fact, and still more useless to ignore it. It would be less serious than it is but for the false position which has for the last three centuries been given to the Bible. We have, after all, only returned to the position of the Christians of the second generation after the Apostles ; the Bible has to justify itself to us, as it did to them, by the intrinsic reasonableness and value of its contents, and by its

conformity with the historical tradition that the Church derived from the Apostles. The existence and history of the Church is, therefore, one never-failing source of apologetic argument in this respect; and the other is the second mode of treating doctrine to which we would draw attention. After the full and precise statement of the actual doctrine must follow the proof of it, in so far as proof is possible. It is useless to refer an agnostic or secularist for proof to the Bible; what, then, can we rely on? We maintain that every adequate statement of the Christian system must be supported, for its justification to the modern student, by illustrations and explanations drawn from analogy. The great principle revived and traced out into some of its results by Bishop Butler is the only sound method of apology for our generation. But, to speak paradoxically, it is the best apology when it is least apologetic. It is a method that has been chiefly used for defence; but it is most effective when employed not to defend, but to make intelligible, the doctrines of religion. For, as has long been recognized, nothing can be perceived save by comparison and contrast with other things. Even the mind would not be conscious of itself unless it had also the consciousness of external things with which to compare itself. And if a thing may be *perceived* by simple unlikeness, it can only be *comprehended* by likeness. It might be possible to become aware of the existence of something utterly unlike any other object in our experience; but there our knowledge of it would cease. The thing would remain unique, isolated, incomprehensible; we should know nothing of it but its existence and its strangeness. And what is true of phenomena is true of events, the relations of phenomena. They may be perceived by their uniqueness and unlikeness to any other experienced events, but nothing more. They cannot be comprehended or explained. It is not till some point of likeness, some common relation, is detected, that we can really be said to know, much less to comprehend, an object or an event. When this has been done, comparison, explanation, classification, become possible; the phenomenon takes its place in the realm of our thoughts, and is brought into more or less definite relations with the other objects of the mind. Now, analogy, in its widest meaning, is this detection of likenesses; its result is not only, as Butler said, to render a thing probable, but to make it intelligible. An argument from analogy takes place, in reality, whenever the mind grasps a new idea; it is only by the likeness with other things that any object is grasped, and though it is often unconscious, the perception of this likeness is an argument from analogy.

It is obvious that, in the case of religious ideas, this process can by no means be omitted, though many religions and writers on religion seem to have tried to dispense with it. The history of religion is filled with the record of strange and weird systems of mythology, which have remained solitary and unfruitful because incomprehensible from their very strangeness. The objects and events contained in them had so little likeness or analogy to the objects of human experience, that they stand alone, unexplained, and incongruous, like the great boulders which strew the central plain of Europe. Some schools of Christian writers would treat our religion in a similar way. The articles of faith are stated for our acceptance or rejection in the most positive and startling manner ; no attempt is made to render the doctrines acceptable to human thought by any comparison of them with the rest of God's actions in the world of our experience ; the strength of our belief is to be in proportion to the strangeness of the objects proposed for our faith. We do not mean to say that everything in religion can or ought to be explained by us ; no student of Butler can forget how forcibly he uses the analogical argument to show us the probability of our ignorance on many subjects, and the vanity of expecting everything to be made clear. Analogy can only explain part ; it can only show us the lines of God's action running for some way into the infinite unknown, but those lines, it tells us, are but continuations of what we can trace out in the daily experience of the world. Neither do we mean that the truths of religion must be made satisfactory to the reason of man, if by reason is meant an infallible logical machine, which is responsible to no greater force, and controlled by no encompassing power. Religion must commend itself to the whole nature of man ; the analogies on which we depend are taken from the whole experience of the human race, and may be discovered, not only by reason, or even consciously, but by the accumulated instincts and unreasoning impulses which are drawn from life and produce life. In the work before us Dr. Westcott does not often employ this method ; it does not come within his scope. But he gives an admirable illustration of it, though the thought is not, of course, new, in his treatment of the subject of forgiveness:—

'Here there is nothing unreal ; nothing inconsistent with the purest images which we can form of the justice and holiness of God ; nothing which is not confirmed by the experience of the human soul as it strives to forgive. The penalty of wrong must be borne ; and we are so constituted that we can take another's burden and communicate to him of the fulness of our strength. We can even see in some

degree how this outflow of regenerating love transforms the consequences of the past. *Such teachings of life are the vantage-ground of faith* (p. 133).

It is this 'vantage-ground of faith' that is secured for us by the analogical explanation of religious doctrines. If a dogma finds no warrant in human experience, answers no appeal from the human heart, it is, as Dr. Westcott says, 'unreal'; it is not only incredible, but in reality inconceivable, though men may delude themselves by a profession of faith in it. We believe that no kind of apology would be so fruitful as a comprehensive attempt to bring theological doctrines within the grasp of men of commonplace thoughts and simple experience by pointing out the analogies with which every sphere of life, every kind of knowledge, supply us. The want of such explanations of Christianity accounts in great measure for the lifelessness and unreality of the religious element in men's lives. Religion lies outside the general course of their interests, their joys, and their sufferings. It is with many, perhaps most, connected only with their hopes and fears for a future life; they have never been taught to see what our Lord's parables could teach them, that the same God is working in us and round us at all times, and is working by the same laws. The two remarkable attempts that have been lately made in this direction make us wish for something more comprehensive and systematic. Mr. Fowle's *New Analogy*, interesting and suggestive as it is, is scarcely adequate, were it even free from positive errors; while Mr. Drummond's very important book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, is devoted more to the practical than the speculative side of religion, and does not pretend to do more than partially to illustrate the subject. A full investigation of the doctrines of religion from this point of view would do more to attract and conciliate scientific men than even the most conclusive refutation of their objections, and certainly more than the peevish carping at their methods and conclusions which often assumes the name of apologetic writing. For, as Mr. Drummond forcibly points out, the great discovery and guiding principle of our age is the unity and continuity of law, and this, by the analogical treatment, may be traced in the sphere of religion also.

We will attempt to illustrate what we have been saying, though only for the sake of illustration, not as wishing to claim special cogency or interest for our analogies. It has long seemed to us that the darkest and most difficult of all theological doctrines, the Atonement, might be in some

degr
Butl
that
to f
suffe
from
his
Chri
anal
expe
Inca
man
law.
fact,
fore,
not a
but
race,
bein
like
sket
Now
the
see t
of a
to th
whic
in it
this
of l
posi
from
as t
acts,
our
but
sligh
Rep
upon
puni

assu
belie
not
com

degree illuminated by analogies drawn from human life. Butler stopped short with the conclusive proof from analogy that the innocent suffer for the guilty. He did not attempt to follow this out into the deeper questions, why did Christ suffer? and how were His sufferings effectual to cleanse us from our sins? That he did not do this seems to result from his neglect of the Incarnation as the central doctrine of Christianity, and from his overlooking the importance of the analogy of human forgiveness. Dr. Westcott, as might be expected, takes the Scotist view, whereby it is held 'that the Incarnation would have been necessary for the fulfilment of man's destiny, even if he had perfectly followed the Divine law.' This view, then, makes the Incarnation the central fact, that for which man was created. We approach, therefore, the Atonement from this point of view, and we see in it, not a vicarious substitution of a Divine Victim for sinful man, but the Pattern Man, the Leader and Representative of our race, voluntarily offering Himself, not instead of man, but as being truly Man, whom 'in all things it behoved to be made like unto His brethren.' This is, of course, only a brief sketch of what has been frequently and ably set forth before. Now, starting from this view of the Atonement, emphasizing the representative character of Christ's Manhood, may we not see that His Death is analogous to the conduct of the chief of a nation who should throw in his lot with his people, even to the extent of suffering the punishment for their offence in which he had not shared? If such a case has never occurred in its entirety, at least it is not inconceivable; it is not—and this is all analogy need show—inconsistent with what we know of human nature. A leader, conscious and proud of his position as the head of his race, might well refuse to shrink from the responsibility of their acts, might well offer himself as their representative to suffer the consequences of those acts. Human generosity has often done greater things; but our object is not to illustrate the greatness of the sacrifice, but to show, by analogy, the cause and explanation, in some slight degree, of Christ's sufferings. Once see in Him the Representative Man, and human analogies will throw light upon His sufferings and death, and upon their relation to our punishment for sin.

But there is the further question, How do we receive the assurance of forgiveness from the death of Christ? Here we believe that the analogy of human forgiveness will explain, not the fact itself, but the mysteriousness of the fact. The commonest case of forgiveness that we know, say a mother's

forgiveness of her child's offence, possesses an element which is inexplicable by the mere reason. A child who has offended and feels his fault and his mother's anger, is grieved and mournful; he 'goes heavily,' his faculties of life are checked. With forgiveness, complete and accepted forgiveness, there comes a change that we can only describe as regenerative, lifegiving: the offender passes from death into life, the offence is forgotten, the load is lifted from him. Can this change be explained? Is it not rather a mystery, incomprehensible to anyone who has not experienced it, but a fact to anyone who has known forgiveness? The objection might easily be made to this restorative effect—as it is often made to the assurance of forgiveness received from the Atonement—that it destroys personal responsibility, and by another's action sets a man free, not only from the external results of his act, but from the guilt itself. Nothing, it may be said, can relieve a man from the burden of his sin, no assurance of forgiveness can do more than convince him that others have forgotten his offence. But the simple answer is, that forgiveness, in our own experience, does effect more than this. As Dr. Westcott, though in a somewhat different connection, observes, 'we can even see in some degree how this outflow of *regenerating love* transforms the consequences of the past.' A feeling of freedom and life, of fresh and instinctive happiness, is the result, in human experience, of complete forgiveness; the only requisites are, first, the thorough consciousness of sin, and then the certainty that the forgiveness is complete and absolute. The Atonement, the Cross of Christ, as has often been said, both stimulates the consciousness of sin, by its awful revelation of the results of sin, and also conveys—as no word, no other act could convey—the assurance that the forgiveness of Him against Whom we have offended is unbounded and complete.

These two considerations then, taken together, seem to throw as much light as human analogies can throw upon the mystery of the Atonement. The analogy of a leader's share in the acts and in the punishment of his people shows that the injustice, if injustice it be, is not confined to the theological account of the Death of Christ, but results from the 'solidarity' of mankind, and may be met with in our daily experience; the analogy of human forgiveness tells us that Redemption through the Cross of Christ has its image in the commonest relations of man to man. Of course, there are other and deeper mysteries in the Atonement, and perhaps man's intellect will never be able to pass beyond Dr. Westcott's

confession of ignorance : ' How His life and death avails with the Father for us is a question which we have no power to answer.' We have only tried to illustrate the human aspect of the Atonement : its justice, and the restorative power of its assurance of forgiveness. But whether our analogies are valid or not, we would plead for some such method of expounding theological truths. The regions of human life and experience that supply the counterparts of these truths need not be strange and remote ; they need not be confined to the discoveries of the learned, but may lie open to the thoughts and perceptions of the simple and ignorant. One thing is certain, that a religious system which cannot be explained, which cannot be brought into the common experience of men, will, even if accepted in theory, remain fruitless in practice ; it will have no bearings on life.

This brings us to the third mode in which we have said all theological doctrines should be treated. After being stated and explained by analogy, they should lastly be shown in their practical results, in their relations to life and conduct. Here, fortunately, we need not spend much time ; for this mode of treatment is admirably illustrated by Dr. Westcott in the present work. We are not thinking so much of the moral and practical results of Christianity as they are usually considered, of the actual improvement it has wrought in men's conduct and in social life, for this is now a well-worn subject ; but we are thinking of the results of Christian doctrines upon the inner life and upon the mental character. There is room for a systematic exposition of the alteration which the articles of faith have produced and ought to produce in our thoughts about the world and life. In these days, when men are giving up the doctrines, but are unconsciously clinging to the intellectual results and accompaniments of those doctrines—because they cannot shake off the atmosphere in which they and their fathers have lived and breathed—it is very important that they should be shown the immense and far-reaching results of what they think are abstract dogmas. Such, for example, is the influence of the doctrine of the Church upon our conception of human society, the transformation of Jewish and Pagan exclusiveness and individualism into the modern idea of the brotherhood of man by S. Paul's analogical exposition of our membership one with another. Another instance we will give, in Dr. Westcott's own words about the final coming of Christ :—

' It is a Judgment universal and personal. In its universal aspect it is the supreme declaration of the truth that there is an end, a goal

for creation, a purpose to be fulfilled, a will to be accomplished. We, who see but small fragments of social movement which distract and engross us, are apt to regard history as an aimless succession of changes. Such would be the judgment which a being of narrower faculties might form from observing a few days or hours of our individual lives. But from time to time revolutions, which are seen to be the intelligible results of the past, reveal the reality of a law of progress in the life of humanity. By the revelation of the final Judgment we are enabled to see that for mankind, as for men, there is an appointed close to earthly work.'

This 'judgment of the world,' which 'is something infinitely more, though it includes this, than the just retribution of individuals,' must, if we accept it as a truth, colour our whole conception of history, and enter into all our speculations as to the future course of society.

It is not necessary, were it even possible in our space, to develop this method at greater length. The Incarnation, and its elevation of all human life and conditions into the sphere of the Divine and Eternal; the doctrine of the Trinity, with its profound bearings upon our conceptions of family life, and its substitution, so to speak, of Love for Power as the central thought of the universe; the consistency and reality given by the doctrines of Original Sin and of the Fall to our theories of human nature, are instances of the way in which such a method might be worked, and will suggest the value of a systematic development of it. For, as in the case of analogies, these thoughts lie scattered about us in many forms, and many of them only need to be put together to impress any thoughtful student with the profound importance of Christianity, and its complete harmony with our deepest needs, our loftiest thoughts, and our most varied destinies. Without some such demonstration of the far-reaching consequences of Christian dogmas men tend to fall into the state of mind that Dr. Westcott describes in solemn words: 'Our eyes are dim and our hearts are cold. We fancy that that is far off which is about our feet. *We treat as a thought almost indifferent that which is a revelation of the issues of life.*'

ART. IV.—A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE MIRACLE AT BETH-HORON.

1. *The Speaker's Commentary*, vol. ii. Canon Espin on Joshua. (London, 1872.)
2. *Commentary on Old Testament*. Edited by Bishop ELLICOTT, vol. ii. Rev. C. H. Waller on Joshua. (London, 1883.)
3. *Commentary on Joshua*. By Dr. KEIL. (Edinburgh, 1857.)
4. *Can we Believe in Miracles?* By GEORGE WARINGTON. (London.)

IN this article we propose to submit to a critical examination the miraculous event recorded in the Book of Joshua, chap. x. 12-14 :—

'Then spake Joshua to the Lord, in the day when the Lord delivered up the Amorites before the children of Israel, and he said in the sight of Israel, "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon." And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day. And there was no day like that, before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man: for the Lord fought for Israel.'

The first thing that strikes us on reading this passage is that the miracle here indicated is unique of its kind. Nothing else like it is to be found in the pages of Scripture. At the command of Joshua, or perhaps rather we should say his prayer, the sun stood still in the heavens while he took vengeance on his foes. Let us see what is involved by this occurrence as literally and popularly understood. The apparent motion of the sun from east to west, we now know, is produced by the earth revolving on its axis. The appearance, therefore, of the sun standing still in the sky would be produced by a cessation for a time of the rotation of the earth; and the immediate consequence of such a sudden stoppage would be that everything which rests or moves on the face of the earth would be violently projected into space with a velocity considerably greater than that of a cannon ball, just as a stone is projected from a catapult. To avert this disastrous result the law of centrifugal force must have been temporarily suspended, and by Divine intervention every

separate pebble and grain of sand must miraculously have been held in its place. And that this *could* be done by the bare fiat of the Almighty nobody will have the hardihood to deny. Only believe that the God of nature is indeed omnipotent, and it follows there is for Him no distinction of difficult and easy. By the mere exercise of His will He can lay His finger on the great 'wheel of nature' (S. James, iii. 6) and arrest the revolutions of the planets, suspending the laws of motion and gravitation, which at first He imparted to matter, by the higher law of His direct providential interference. And this amazing breach in the uniformity of His universe we believe He might conceivably vouchsafe to produce, in order that a little army of His chosen people might, at a critical moment, be enabled to win a more complete victory over their enemies in the fields of Palestine.¹ But the thought will occur, even to those who have no desire to minimize the miraculous element in the Sacred Records, Is this in keeping with what we know of the Divine Economy? Is it not God's way of working always to work out the greatest possible results by the simplest possible means—to ensure the grandest issues by the least intricate machinery? In human affairs we use the contemptuous phrase, 'To break a butterfly on the wheel,' for a disproportionate expenditure of effort in punishing a puny offender; but with God there is never a waste of power, nor inadequacy of result.

Have we, then, no alternative but to believe that Almighty God secured the overthrow of the Amorites by deranging the solar system, viz. by arresting the revolution of the earth, and counteracting in millions of instances the disruption and devastation which would otherwise have inevitably followed? For all this is involved in the popular interpretation. We do not shrink from believing in this miracle to the fullest extent, if indeed this is the literal meaning, and the only meaning, which the language of the original text will bear. If the inspired record expressly declares that this stupendous thing really came to pass, speaking for the great majority of Christian men, we do not hesitate to say that we are ready to bow implicitly to its authority. The question for us then is, not whether we are bound to believe what the Word of God says, but what in fact it does say. It is a matter essentially of interpretation. The true meaning of the original words we must therefore set ourselves carefully and reverently to investigate.

¹ Some of the old divines thought it worth their while to adduce parallels to the sun staying his course from the heathen mythology; e.g. Bishop Patrick, *in loco*; Thomas Jackson, *Works*, 1673, vol. i. p. 54.

What, then, were the words actually used by Joshua on this memorable occasion? They were *dôm shemesh*, 'Sun, be silent'; *dôm* being from the verb *dâman*, to be silent. And so in v. 13 the literal rendering is 'the sun was silent.' The whole of this passage, from v. 12 to the end of v. 15, is a quotation (Keil, Hävernicks) from a more ancient record entitled, 'The Book of Jasher,' i.e. 'The Book of the Just,' or 'Upright.' This appears to have been a collection of national songs and odes in a metrical form, celebrating the achievements of the great theocratic heroes.¹ The early history of almost every people is found to consist (as Lord Macaulay has pointed out²) of martial lays and artless soul-stirring ballads, like our own 'Chevy Chase'; and these will, for the most part, contain archaic and primitive modes of expression which will sometimes be misunderstood in later and more civilized times. Such a martial poem is that here quoted from the ancient Book of Jasher, and such an archaic form of expression seems to be that used in Joshua's apostrophe,³ 'Sun, be thou silent,' which has no parallel elsewhere in Holy Scripture. Coverdale's translation (1535) is more literal than the Authorized Version: 'Sonne, holde styll at Gibeon, and thou Moone in the valley of Aialon. Then the Sonne helde styll, and ye Moone stode'; but the wording of the original may be exhibited more closely as follows:—

'Then, even on the day in which Jehovah delivered up the Amorites to the sons of Israel, spake Joshua unto Jehovah, and said, in the presence of Israel,

"Silent, O Sun, be thou upon Gibeon,
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon.
And silent was the sun,
And stayed the moon,
Till the people avenged them on their enemies."'

The stichometrical arrangement of this address, which Joshua, according to the Chaldee paraphrast, 'sang' or 'declaimed' (like an early Taillefer) at the head of his army, sufficiently indicates the poetical and rhythmic character of what is to follow, and serves to remind us that the language is to be understood in accordance with the spirit of poetry and not as plain unimaginative prose. What, then, is the probable meaning of the sun being 'silent'? For this, we cannot but

¹ Renan, *Hist. des Langues Sémitiques*, p. 127, 3rd ed.

² *Lays of Ancient Rome*, preface.

³ The language of the book of Joshua is of a very early type. Pusey, *Lectures on Daniel*, p. 312 (3rd ed.).

think, furnishes a key-note to the entire passage, and is the cardinal point on which all the rest will turn; inasmuch as the appended remark in the latter part of v. 13, that the sun 'stood still' and 'hasted not to go down,' is merely, as Dr. Keil observes, an amplification or expansion of the words really uttered by Joshua in the heat of the conflict.

In Biblical exegesis there is always a presumption that what is new is not true. And this is natural. There is little likelihood of a 'find' being reserved for a newcomer in a field so diligently cultivated and ransacked for centuries by seekers after hid treasure. In proposing, therefore, a novel interpretation of a passage of Scripture, it will be justly required that what we venture to advance must be established by some strong proofs and analogies, and we must be prepared to show that it is more probable than any other view hitherto held, while no insuperable objection lies against it. The view here suggested is, we need not say, put forth with becoming diffidence as a tentative solution of a confessedly enigmatical passage.

The language used being, as we have seen, poetical and of extreme antiquity, ought fairly to be construed in accordance with metaphorical expressions of a similar kind used in primitive times. And here we may obtain valuable assistance from the discoveries of modern science in comparative philology. In matters of verbal criticism the modern student occupies a coign of vantage as compared with early interpreters and commentators. Thanks to the chronological telescope that this youngest of the sciences has placed in our hands, we nowadays—paradoxical as it sounds—stand nearer to the thoughts and forms of expression of the early inhabitants of the world than did our forefathers many centuries ago—nay, than did the Jewish rabbins and the Greek and Latin fathers. M. Renan observes that even educated Jews occasionally found themselves puzzled in the presence of archaic expressions which had fallen into desuetude, sometimes quite misunderstanding certain difficult passages in their ancient literature, and sometimes even substituting in their later works for original usages, which were obscure and embarrassing, others more plain and clear. And these conjectural emendations are often at fault. Thus Lahmi, the supposed name of a brother of Goliath in 1 Chron. xx. 5, has originated in the compiler putting a wrong construction on an older lection, *Beth hal-lahmi*, 'a Beth-lehemite,' in 2 Sam. xxi. 19. This writer further maintains that when the oldest Hebrew has been thus misunderstood, modern philology has

a right
interp
exeges
Septua

To
words
are use
from a
to act.
ceased
silent
sistent
now tr
tions,
of ana
to mal

It
roots
no ori
contai
idea o
sive o
later t
noise
and e
Bähr
"wor
In the
cry o
sound
world
"The
of the
sense
and o
of the
light
doth

1 A
2 C
in Lar
3 I
4 I
Heb. A
bright
5 I

a right to step in to correct the mistakes and reform the interpretations of the ancients.¹ Still less in a *crux* of exegesis will the rendering of ancient versions, such as the Septuagint and Vulgate, be deemed definitively conclusive.

To come, then, to the point at issue. Among the Hebrews words meaning 'silent' often have a wider application, and are used of one who abstains not merely from speaking, but from acting.² Thus 'the sun was silent' may mean he ceased to act. But in what way? Is it that he ceased to move, or ceased to shine? Our contention is that the sun becoming *silent* or *dumb* can mean nothing else so naturally and consistently as that it became *dark* or *obscured*. This we will now try to establish by adducing, first some general considerations, relevant to this argument, and then a sufficient number of analogous usages and illustrations in detail which will serve to make it probable.

It is laid down as an axiom by philologists that all verbal roots originally referred only to human action. Accordingly no original root is found meaning 'to shine,' because that idea contains no element of personal activity.³ How, then, did the idea of shining ultimately find expression? Words expressive of brightness and colour may always be observed arising later than, and taking their origin from, those expressive of noise or sound, which do contain the idea of subjective force and exertion. We are not surprised then to find that, as Bähr has noted, 'nearly in all ancient languages "light" and "word," "to lighten" and "to speak," are kindred ideas.' In the Hebrew verb *tzahâl*, for example, the meanings 'to cry out' and 'to glitter' coincide.⁴ 'Between light and sound, the two most infinite in their revelations of the outer world, there seems to be a distinct and peculiar connexion. "They are," says Lamennais, merely "two different organs of the same faculty, two different manifestations of the same sense." Hence, the Greek Apollo is the god both of melody and of brightness.'⁵ The idea of manifestation or discovery of the unknown or dark is common to both language and light alike. According to the apostolic definition, 'Whatever doth make manifest is light' (Eph. v. 13).

¹ *Hist. des Langues Sémitiques*, pp. 156, 157.

² Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 344, col. i. An eye that 'ceases' to weep in Lam. ii. 18 is said 'to be silent' (Heb. *dâmam*).

³ L. Noiré, *M. Müller and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 84.

⁴ Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, p. 279 (Eng. trans.). Compare also Heb. *hâlal* to sing, praise, celebrate (whence 'hallelujah'), also to be bright (Gesenius, p. 226).

⁵ Farrar, *Chapters on Language*, p. 209.

'Speech is but broken light upon the depth
Of the unspoken.'¹

And it is highly significant, in this connexion, to find the Incarnate Revelation of the Father's will spoken of in the same context as 'the Word' and 'the True Light' (S. John, i. 1, 9), both indicating one and the same function with a reference to different senses.

It would lead us too far astray from our main argument if we were to enter here into consideration of the physical phenomena involved in light and sound. It need only be remembered that both are propagated in the same manner, by means of waves or undulations in the medium through which they are transmitted. As the pitch of a musical note depends on the number of aerial waves which strike the ear in a second, so the colour of light depends on the number of ethereal waves which reach the eye in the same period of time.² Thus colour is to light what pitch is to sound, and we have physical reasons for expecting that words originally suggestive only of sound will come to be frequently applied to light and its modifications.³

In all languages we find instances of words which at first denoted sound, noise, outcry, being subsequently applied to the phenomena of the visible world. Thus, Lat. *clarus* and Ger. *hell* both mean loud, shrill-toned, as well as bright;⁴ and our own word 'loud' itself (Ger. *laut*, Old Ger. *hlut*, Lat. [*in*]-*clytus*) is near akin to Ger. *läuter*, bright, clear. The word which last presented itself, 'bright,' A.-Sax. *beorht* (compare Goth. *bairhts*, Ger. *pracht*, brightness), is the same word as Prov. Ger. *bracht*, noise, Old H. Ger. *pracht*, *praht*, noise

¹ George Eliot, *The Spanish Gypsy*, p. 104.

² See Tyndall, *Six Lectures on Light*, p. 56 seq. (third edition).

³ M. Scheler in pointing out the connexion between Fr. *éclater*, to flash or lighten (Old Fr. *esclater*), and the Netherlandish *klateren*, to clatter, observes 'le vocable signifiant frapper l'ouïe a servi pour signifier frapper la vue. On dit donc aussi bien de la lumière que du son, qu'elle *éclate*' (*Dict. d'Etymologie Française*, p. 150). Similarly our own verbs 'to speak' and 'to sparkle' are radically identical; 'speak' for *spreak*, A.-Sax. *sprecan* (Ger. *sprechen*, Icel. *spraki*, a rumour), and 'spark,' A.-Sax. *spearca*, being both akin to Swed. and Icel. *spraka*, to crackle (Dan. *sprage*), from the common root *sparg*, to make a noise, Sans. *sphurj*, to crash. Compare Scot. *crack*, to talk familiarly, *cracky*, talkative.

⁴ Lat. *cla-rus* (whence Old Fr. Old Eng. *cler*, bright, Eng. 'clear'), is probably related to *cla-m-are*, to cry aloud, from the root *kal*, to make a noise (see Skeat, *Etymolog. Dictionary*, p. 113). Compare Greek *kal-ein*, Lat. *cal-are*, Eng. *hal-loo*, and, no doubt, Ger. *hell*, and *hellen*, to resound; also 'clarion,' the loud-toned horn, like Heb. *shôphâr*, a trumpet, from *shâphar*, to be bright.

(compare Lat. *frag-or*, Eng. *brag*, and *bray*, Sansk. *bhrāj*, to shine). The verbal form A.-Sax. *beorhtian*, to brighten, is used in the sense of to resound (Beowulf), as well as to shine (Béda);¹ and an Old English poem (ab. 1244) says of the nightingale that she

'Song so schille and so brihte,
That feor and ner me hit i-herde.'

The Owl and Nightingale, l. 1655 (Percy Soc. ed.)²

That is to say, 'She sang so shrill and *loud* that far and near men heard it.' With a similar transition of meaning *twire*, used by Chaucer for the chirping of a bird (Tyrwhitt), is used by Shakspeare for the twinkling of the stars:³

'When sparkling stars *twire* not thou gild'st the even.'

Sonnet, xxviii.

To take another instance. The same primitive root *bhā* which yields Greek *φημί* (*phēmī*), I speak, Lat. *fari*, to speak, and Eng. *em-phasis*, appears in Sanskrit *bhā-mi*, meaning to shine or give light, and Eng. *phase*, or *phasis* of the moon.⁴ In Greek, *λαμπρός* (*lamprós*) denotes sonorous, clear-sounding, as well as shining, brilliant. In Latin, Quintilian enumerates among different kinds of voices, '*candida et fusca*,' the 'bright' and the 'dark,' meaning the 'clear' and the 'husky.' Pliny uses *surdus*, deaf, of a colour in the sense of dim (*Nat. Hist.*

¹ Ettmüller, *Lexicon Anglo-Sax.* p. 289.

² See Wedgwood, *Dict. of Eng. Etymology*, p. lv. (2nd ed.). Compare *ἐλαμψε φάμα*, a divine command shone forth, Soph., *Æd. Tyrannus*, l. 473; *παῖαν λάμπει*, *Id.* l. 187.

³ So Nares, Collier, Wedgwood, Dyce (*Remarks on Shakspeare*, p. 273; but the true reading in the passage of Chaucer referred to seems to be *twitrip*, 'twittereth,' rather than *twireth*; see *Trans. of Boethius*, ed. Morris, p. 68, l. 1875 (E.E.T.S.). Compare, however, 'tinkle' and Dut. *tintelen*, to sparkle (Sewel), with *twinkling* used in Old English for the tinkling or sound of a harp (H. Coleridge, *Glossarial Index*).

⁴ Curtius, *Griech. Etymologie*, i. 262. Of the same radical identity are Greek *pha-os*, *phōs*, light, *phēmē*, report, Lat. *fama*, and Sansk. *bhā-ma*, light, which Benfey equates with our *beam* of light, A.-Sax. *bedm*, and *bedmian*, to shine. Compare Zend *bāma*, brightness. Probably Old Eng. *bême*, a trumpet, A.-Sax. *bedm*, *bême*, is radically the same word. See Monier Williams, *Sansk. Dict.* s.vv. *bhā*, to shine, and *bhāsh*, to speak. For the connexion of 'light' words with 'sound' words compare also *blaze*, a bright flame of fire (A.-Sax. *blāse*), ultimately identical with 'to blaze abroad' = to proclaim (Mark i. 45), O. Eng. *blāsen*, to sound as a trumpet (Dan. *blāse*, Dut. *blasen*, to blow a trumpet), and *blare*, to roar. Similarly *blazon* denotes (1) a loud proclamation, a trumpeting forth (Shakspeare), (2) an heraldic painting in bright colours.

xxxvii. 18), a word cognate with our *swart*, *swarthy* (A.-Sax. *swear*t, black).¹ Compare—

'He herde a vois which cried *dimme*.'

Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, ii. 293 (ed. Pauli).

'He herde a murmurynge,

Ful lowe and *dym*.'

Chaucer, *Knight's Tale*, l. 1575 (ed. Morris).

'The silence was at rest and *dim*.'

D. G. Rossetti, *Pax Vobis*.

By a like interchange of ideas we speak of the 'tone' or 'harmony' of colours, and of a 'chromatic,' or colour, scale in music; while gaudy and glaring hues, which we in colloquial language sometimes designate as 'loud,' are described by the French as 'crying' (*criant*), by the Germans as 'screaming' (*schreiend*) colours.²

Indeed, we have the authority of Professor Max Müller for regarding the word 'red,' or 'ruddy,' as etymologically denoting the 'crying' or 'roaring' colour:³ compare A.-Sax. *readd*, red, *rudu*, redness, Ger. *roth*, O.H. Ger. *rôt*, Icel. *rjóð-r*, Lat. *rutilus*, Greek *e-ruth-rós*, beside Icel. *rjót-a*, to roar, Lat. *rudere*, Greek *róthos*, a roar, Sansk. *rud*, to cry. Thus 'ruddy' is significantly the 'rowdy' or noisy colour; and it was something more than a fanciful analogy when Sanderson, the mathematician, who was born blind, conceived that red most resembles the note of a trumpet, or the crowing of a cock;⁴ and contrariwise Massieu, the Abbé Sicard's deaf and dumb pupil, thought that a trumpet note must be like scarlet.⁵ On the same principle it might probably be shown that 'yellow' (A.-Sax. *geolo*, Teutonic base *gelwa*), when traced to its origin, is etymologically no more than a 'yeller';—the bright golden tint that sends out its rays like so many sharp, clear-toned notes, containing the same root *ghar*, to glow, shine, rejoice, or sing loudly, as 'yell' (A.-Sax. *gellan*, Teut. base *gall*).⁶ Indeed Kruse, who was stone deaf, maintained

¹ Skeat, *Etym. Dict.* s.v. Compare '*cæcus clamor*,' Val. Flaccus, ii. 461; '*blind mouths*,' *Lycidas*, l. 119; '*blind ears*,' Soph. *Æd. Tyr.* l. 371.

² 'The mob likes *loud* colours in a picture.' *The Quarterly Review*, vol. 141, p. 508.

³ *Contemporary Review*, Feb. 1878; *Oxford Essays*, 1856, p. 62.

⁴ It is perhaps more than a coincidence too that Fr. *coquelicot*, *Languedoc. cacaraca*, Picard. *cogriacot*, signify (1) the cry of the cock, (2) a scarlet poppy. *Peony* and *pean*, though related, lie too far apart to be compared.

⁵ Farrar, *Origin of Language*, p. 126; *Chapters on Language*, p. 210.

⁶ 'In the dictionary of roots we do not find anything about shining,

that to his perception the sound of a trumpet was yellow, that of a drum red, that of the organ green, and other instances of similar comparisons are not wanting.¹

The analogies exhibited thus far serve to illustrate the general principle that words suggestive of sound readily merge into others which denote light and colour. And the interchange of these related ideas, it may be observed, is not yet quite obsolete. It may be traced still in the language of modern poetry and picturesque prose. Thus Faber, of a strain of music, inquires:—

‘Is it sound, or fragrance, or vision?
Vocal light wavering down from above?’

And George Herbert, of singing in the sunshine, says:—

‘His beams shall cheer my breast, and both so twine,
Till ev’n his *beams sing*, and my *musick shine*.’²

Christmas.

Compare also the following:—

‘If my *sparkelyng voyce*, lower, or hier,
Which fear and shame, so wofully doth tyre.’
Wyatt, *Tottel’s Miscellany*, 1557, p. 70 (ed. Arber).

And so Crashaw of the nightingale:—

‘Then you might hear her kindle her soft voice
In the close murmur of a *sparkling noise*.’
Music’s Duel, l. 84.

‘As the chorus [of bells] swelled and swelled till the air seemed made of sound; little *flames*, vibrating too, as if the sound had

flashing, or burning; no thoughtful etymologist, even if he found them, would allow them to pass as primitive intuitions.’—Noiré, *Philosophy of Language*, p. 84.

¹ Tylor, *Early Hist. of Mankind*, p. 71 (third ed.). On ‘colour-hearing,’ or the association of certain colours with particular notes, see the *Musical World*, vol. lx. p. 37 (1882).

² Compare:—

‘He saw, in mystic choir, around him move
The stars of song, Heaven’s *burning minstrelsy*.’
T. Moore, *The Genius of Harmony*.

May it not have been that the Platonic notion of the harmony of the spheres, ‘for ever singing as they shine,’ originated at first in a mistake due to a confusion between words for shining and sounding which were once almost interchangeable?—e.g., compare Lat. *cāno*, to sing, Greek *kanazo*, to sound, Sansk. *kan*, to sound, beside Lat. *cānus*, gleaming white, *cāneo*, to be white, Sansk. *kan*, to shine. See Sir T. Browne, *Religio Medici*, part ii., sect. ix.; Shakspeare, *Merchant of Venice*, v. 1; C. W. King, *The Gnostics*, p. 93; Sir G. C. Lewis, *Astronomy of the Ancients*, p. 131.

VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV. Y

caught fire, burst out between the turrets of the palace and on the girdling towers. That sudden *clang*, that leaping *light*, fell on Romola like sharp wounds.—G. Eliot, *Romola*, ch. xxxvi.

‘What sudden *blaze of song*
Spreads o’er th’ expanse of Heaven?’

Keble, *Christmas Day*.

‘There is a double joy, I think, in the great heart of the sunlight as, *almost with a shout* that one can hear, it floods the opened chamber with itself.’—Phillips Brooks (*Sunday Magazine*, Oct. 1882, p. 648).

‘When I wakened there was a *whisper in light* in the windy.’—Mrs. Whitney, *The Gayworthys*, ch. xx.¹

P. J. Bailey in his *Festus* has many similar usages—e.g. ‘Star unto star *speaks light*’ (p. 9); ‘The *shining voices* of the stars’ (p. 122). He speaks of the ‘*deep-toned Saturn*’ and ‘the *shrill-voiced moon*’ (p. 120), and of the sun as—

Harmonist of Heaven,
The music of whose golden lyre is light.

Ibid. p. 136.²

In these passages we find voices sparkling, a peal of bells flaming, a song blazing, as well as sunbeams singing, the stars speaking, and sunlight shouting. It is more important for our argument to observe that the counterpart to these metaphors is also found. There is an analogy quite as striking between the privation of light and the privation of sound. Silence after speech is the darkening or extinguishing of the light.³ Accordingly we discover an etymological connexion existing between the words *dumb* (Old Eng. *dum*) and *dim*.⁴

¹ Similar to this is the phrase ‘peep of day,’ where *peep* (cf. A. V. Is. viii. 19) is to cheep or cry small like a chicken, to chirp or pipe, from old Fr. *pepier* (F. *piper*), Lat. *pipire*; a little gleam of incipient light being compared to a faint low sound. Compare ‘*Pypyng*, crye of yonge bryddys.’—*Prompt. Parvulorum* (1440): ‘At daye *pype*, à la *pipe* du jour’—Palsgrave, *Lesclarissement* (1530); ‘By the *pype* of daye’—*Life of Lord Grey*, p. 23 (Camden Soc.). Also Lancashire *skrike-o-day*, Scot. *skreigh* of day, day-break, literally the shrill cry of the day. See Wedgwood, *Dict. of Eng. Etymology*, p. xxv; Grimm, *Teut. Mythology*, ii. 746; and Palmer, *Folk-etymology*, p. 278.

² So Ang.-Sax. *swegel*, the bright sky, is allied not only to *swegele*, bright, loud, but to *swegele*, a pipe, Goth. *swiglon*, to pipe (Ettmüller, 751; Diefenbach, ii. 365). Grimm compares with this the German expression ‘the moon *pipes up* her light,’ and the old Fr. *par sun lalbe* ‘by the sound of the dawn,’ a clang (*dyne*) being coceived as sent forth by the light of sunrise (*Teut. Mythology*, ii. 745, Eng. trans.).

³ Pers. *khamosh*, dumb, silent, is used also for the extinguishing of a candle (Johnson, *Pers. and Arab. Dict.* p. 536).

⁴ Compare Icel. *dumba*, a dark mist, *dumbr*, gloomy, misty; *dimma*,

In Old Danish *dum* means dark, dim, or obscure, as well as mute, speechless (Wolff, *Ord-bog*, 1779, s. v.)

Narrowing our view from these general considerations down to the particular point towards which we have been approximating, let us see how they bear on the passage under discussion. Do we find any similar forms of expression in other ancient writings which may serve to throw some light on this peculiar phrase, 'the sun was dumb'? We think we do. The oldest book in the world, not excepting probably any part of the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, is the Sanskrit *Rig-Veda*, which is a collection of hymns to the primeval gods, dating back to about B.C. 1500. In these we find that one name for the sun is *Pûru-ravas*, meaning literally 'much-roaring,' or 'much-resounding,' but used to express the idea of 'endowed with much light.'¹ Here, 'The fire cries with light,' (*Rig-Veda*, vi. 3, 6) is a primitive way of saying 'it burns brightly.' 'The sun cries like a new-born child' (*Id.* ix. 74, 1) is just another way of saying he is risen and is shining brilliantly.'² A popular belief formerly prevailed in Germany that an audible noise was made by the rising sun. Old folk-songs describe the music of sunrise as surpassingly sweet: 'With dulcet din his orb he rolled, so that compared with it clang of strings or song of bird were like copper beside gold.' Jacob Grimm accounts for this notion 'by the deep affinity existing between light and sound, colours and tones' (*Teutonic Mythology*, ii. 741-2, Eng. trans.) Bold metaphors like these lie at the source of all human speech. And we can easily see that when the sun had set, or was obscured, the natural antithesis to these idioms would be 'the sun has ceased to cry,' or simply 'the sun is silent.'

But fortunately we are not left to deal in mere conjectures on this head. Metaphors precisely the same as the words now under consideration are found in other languages. The old Latin writer, Cato the Censor, more than once has the phrase 'lunâ silenti,' i.e. 'in the silence of the moon,' for the period of the new moon when her light is not seen. 'Evehito [stercus]

to grow dark; *dimmr*, dark, dusky, of the voice deep, hollow (Cleasby, p. 100). Icel. *dumb-rauðr*, dark-red (Cleasby, 773). Also Ger. *dämmern*, Swiss *dimmern*, to grow dusky, Finn. *tumma*, darkish. See Diefenbach, *Goth. Sprache*, ii. 635; Ettmüller, *Lex. Anglo-Saxonicum*, p. 560.

¹ *Pûru-ravas*. *Rava*, from root *ru*, denotes (1) sound, cry; (2) colour, brightness, akin to *red*. (M. Müller, *Oxford Essays*, 1856, p. 62.)

² M. Müller, *ibid.*; Noiré, *M. Müller and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 85. Similar probably is the meaning of the following line in an Assyrian hymn to Nin-dara, the nocturnal sun, who was conceived as

lunà silenti, (*De Re Rusticâ*, cap. xxix.)¹ 'carry out the dung in the time of new moon;' and again, 'Prata primo vere stercoato *lunà silenti*' (*Id.* cap. li.);² 'Manure the meadows in early spring when the moon is not shining.' This figure of speech long survived in Italian. Florio in his *New World of Words*, 1611, gives '*Silente luna*, the very moment that the Moone changeth;' '*Silente*, used also for the first day of the new Moone;' and further, '*Luna tacita*, the new Moone, or the conjunction of the Moone with the Sun, she being not seene.'

Dante makes use of the same expressive metaphor in the opening canto of the '*Inferno*,' when he says the evil beast

'Mi ripingeva là dove 'l *Sol tace*.'

Canto i. l. 60.

'Impelled me where *the sun in silence rests*.'

CAREY.

i.e. where the sun was obscured or darkened. And again, a little further on,

'Io venni in luogo d' ogni *luce muto*.'

Canto v. l. 28.

'Into a place I came

Where *light was silent all*.'

CAREY.

Nay, the idiom is not altogether foreign to English. The poet who knew by his own sad experience how 'deaf' the eye is, to which the harmonies and beauties of the sunlight henceforward speak in vain, introduces the blinded Samson saying—

'The sun to me is dark
And *silent* as the moon,
When she deserts the night,
Hid in her vacant interlunar cave.'³

Samson Agonistes, l. 86.

combating and conquering the darkness in his course through the underworld—

'Thou, during thy action, *roarest* like a bear.'

Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic*, p. 176.

i.e. he shines strongly and lustily when routing the powers of darkness.

¹ *Rustici Latini*, Venezia, 1794, tom. ii. p. 40.

² *Id.* p. 152. Forcellini (ed. De Vit) quotes from Pliny, *Nat. Hist.*, '*Quem diem . . . alii silentis lunæ appellant*.' Columella applies the word *silens* to flowers or vines that have not yet budded or germinated, and to eggs in which the young bird has shown no signs of life.

³ Shelley's is evidently a borrowed usage—

'The *silent* moon,
In her interlunar swoon,
Is not sadder in her cell.'

To a Lady with a Guitar.

The illustrations we have now given are enough, perhaps it may be thought more than enough, to lend probability to the interpretation here contended for; but we have thought it necessary to dwell on this point of verbal criticism the more minutely, because, as we have already said, it supplies a key to the further intricacies of the passage.

There remains, however, a strikingly parallel usage still to be adduced, to which we are disposed to attach special significance, inasmuch as it is not only one of venerable antiquity, but presented within the family of Semitic languages, and in words having close affinity to those in the Hebrew text. In the Assyrian inscriptions of Pul there occurs more than once the phrase *dimu shamsi*, 'the setting sun' (Rawlinson, *Inscriptions*, I. 35), where the cuneiform *dimu*, 'setting,' corresponds accurately to the Hebrew *dâmam* (Norris, *Assyrian Dictionary*, vol. i. p. 240). Now, here we have what seems to us a very interesting coincidence—the *dimu shamsi* of Pul answering word for word to the *dôm shemesh* of Joshua. And since there is no doubt that the Assyrian phrase is descriptive of the darkening of the sun at its setting, this lends a strong probability to the argument that the kindred Hebrew idiom must also imply a cessation or withdrawal, rather than a continuance, of the solar light, even though in one case the obscuration is due to the horizon, in the other to tempestuous clouds.

In the language of the ancient poem, Joshua addressed the sun and said, 'Be thou *silent*!' 'Be *dumb*!' His devout aspiration, intelligible enough at the time, was perhaps this—'Sun, be thou *darkened*!' 'Be *dim*! Hide thy beams, until the enemy already daunted and routed through thy eclipse, are utterly overwhelmed and destroyed by my people.'

Using a similar natural figure, children in Madagascar, who for our purpose are a species of contemporary antiquity, sing of 'Mrs. Moon dead by day but living by night,' and call on her to 'wake up' (*The Folk-Lore Journal*, vol. i. p. 103). The American Indians say the moon is 'dead' when she does not shine, and that she comes to life again when she reappears (J. Carver, *Travels*, p. 250; Southey, *Common-Place Book*, vol. ii. p. 565). Compare 'eclipse' Greek *ἐκλείψις*, also used for fainting, Latin, *luna deficiens*. Sometimes the darkened moon is conceived as sleeping; e.g.—

'What though the moon do's *slumber*?

The starres of the night

Will lend thee their light,

Like tapers cleare without number.

Herrick, *The Night Piece, To Julia*.

'The moon *sleeps* with Endymion

And would not be awaked.'

Shakspere, Merchant of Venice, V. i. 109.

As we interpret the narrative, what really occurred was this. The five kings of the Amorites had laid siege to the important city of Gibeon (vv. 4, 5), because it had made peace with the Israelites. Joshua, who was then at Gilgal, upon the urgent request of the Gibeonites set out for the relief of their city; and by a forced march, which lasted all night (v. 9), suddenly arrived before Gibeon early in the morning, and at once began the assault. With the help of the Lord he completely overthrew the Amorites, and drove them before him in confusion down the rocky defile towards Beth-horon. Meanwhile dark thunderclouds had been gathering round the hill tops, and soon a shower of hailstones of unexampled size—lumps of ice such as are known to have fallen in the east weighing nearly a pound—was seen beating down upon the flying enemy. 'The Lord,' we read, 'discomfited them before Israel' (v. 10), no doubt as He discomfited the Philistines on another occasion, by a tempest, and lightning, and thundering (1 Sam. vii. 10; 2 Sam. xxii. 15). This terrific hail was so providentially timed and directed, it appears, as to fall only upon the Amorites; and more actually perished from this cause than by the sword of Israel (v. 11).

Let us turn aside here, for a moment, to remark how prone commentators have ever shown themselves to take the poetical expressions of the Oriental style in the most prosaic and literal, and consequently misleading, exactness. Because it is stated here that 'the Lord cast down *great stones* from heaven upon them' (v. 11), some have imagined that a veritable shower of meteoric stones or aerolites must at that moment have fallen from the skies; and Calmet, by way of illustration, industriously got together a large number of instances of such lapidary showers having taken place. One would have thought that the explanatory clause which the writer hastens to add might have effectually obviated such a blunder, 'They were more which died with *hailstones* than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword' (v. 11). Certainly there was little likelihood of the '*silence* of the sun' being understood by men so enslaved to the letter as this. We may be thankful that some sage expositor has not understood the words of Deborah 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera' (Judges, v. 20), as meaning that a volley of shooting stars, or meteorites, encountered him as he fled in mid career; the probability being that the stars showed themselves adverse in the only way that stars could show themselves adverse, viz. by withdrawing their light and ceasing to shine, being obscured, perhaps, by a storm. Be

that as it may, the means employed for the overthrow of the Amorites at the battle of Beth-horon seem to have been altogether natural—ordinary atmospheric phenomena extraordinarily, and so miraculously, called into requisition. While the dark thunderclouds covered the skies and the heavens were black with wind and hail the victorious Israelites pressed hard on the flying enemy. And when, as the storm subsided, the sun began to shine out again over Gibeon, and the moon to show herself over Ajalon, then it was that Joshua, conscious of the aid which the Lord of the elements had so far afforded him in fulfilment of His promise, earnestly prayed that the sun might continue longer darkened, and that not even the moon might yield her feebler light. And the Lord heard his prayer. The atmospheric conditions which had befriended him at first were miraculously prolonged out of the usual course. And the result was, as we read in v. 13, 'The sun was silent' (that is, was darkened), 'and the moon stayed' (that is, stopped or ceased, namely shining), 'until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the Book of Jasher? So the sun stood' (that is, stayed, desisted, or ceased to discharge its function, viz. of giving light, Heb. *amad*), and that, 'in the midst of heaven' (viz. in the meridian, at noon-day),¹ 'and hastened not to go' (that is, to proceed, walk in his brightness) 'about a whole day.' For the sense attributed here to the Hebrew verb *amad*, to stand,² compare the following passages wherein the same word occurs: 'She conceived again, and bare a son: . . . and stood' (that is, desisted or ceased) 'from bearing' (Gen. xxix. 35. A. V. 'left bearing'); 'If the plague in his sight stand,' i.e. cease spreading (Levit. xiii. 5, A. V. 'be at a stay'); 'The sea stood from its raging' (Jonah i. 15, A. V. 'ceased'): also the following when the verb is different, 'His eyes stood' (Heb. *qâmûh*, i.e. were at a stay or stand, no longer discharged their natural function, A. V. 'were dim'), 'that he could no longer see' (1 Sam. iv. 15). As illustrating the meaning of *amad*

¹ Similarly in an Egyptian calendar of astronomical observations a star is said to be 'in the middle' (*er ak* or *amtu*) when in mid heaven at the moment of its transit or culmination, and so Greek μεσούρ, 'to be in the middle.' See Renouf, *Transactions of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. iii. p. 401.

² It is the same word *amad* that appears as 'hath continued,' Ruth, ii. 7; 'continueth,' Job, xiv. 2. *Dāmam* (to be silent) is rendered 'forbear,' Ezek. xxiv. 17; 'cease,' Jer. xiv. 17, Lam. ii. 18. For the identification of the meaning of the two words here compare the usage of Eng. *still*—(1) motionless, lifeless; (2) hushed, silent. 'The sun was *still*' would quite convey the idea of both verbs.

when applied to the sun, it 'stood,' *i.e.* it ceased to shine, we may note the analogous usage in the astronomical tablets of the Babylonians—a people to whom the Jews were indebted at a very early period for any knowledge they had of astronomy—which have been deciphered from the Assyrian cuneiform as follows: 'The 27th day the moon *is fixed*' (*issaaš*, *i.e.* disappears); 'The moon in the midst of heaven *is fixed*, an eclipse happens, and the gods the four quarters disturb; 'The sun at its extremity *was fixed*' (*izzuš*); 'The moon darkness contracts and southwards *is fixed*' (*issaz*); see Sayce, *Transactions of Society of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. iii. pp. 234, 299, 285, 312.

The Hebrew verb *bô* (בָּא), translated 'to go down' in v. 13, though generally used of the setting of the sun, strictly means no more than to go or come, and motion downwards is no necessary part of its connotation. It is the same word that is rendered 'come' in the following passages: Joel, ii. 31; Hag. ii. 7; Zech. xiv. 5; Mal. iii. 1; and that is used of the gushing forth of tears in Ezek. xxiv. 16.¹ If 'to stand' when predicated of the sun may signify to be stationary or inactive, no longer working, *i.e.* no longer shining, and so to be dark,² then the contrasted word 'to go' or 'move' would naturally mean to resume its activity, to be in operation, to give light and heat, and so to shine;³ and we may compare with this Virgil's expression 'rapidus sol' for the hot flaming sun, which looks like a poetical anticipation of the discovery that heat is merely a mode of motion. In colloquial English, when the sun beaming forth on a gloomy day is said to 'come out,' the expression is very similar.

It thus appears that we have really *two* accounts here of the same occurrence: the one in simple prose narrative, the other in the figurative language of poetry. The author of the Book of Joshua puts on record how the Lord helped the Israelites by sending down a violent hailstorm on their foes; the ancient Book of Jasher celebrates how he helped them by *silencing*, or darkening, the sun and moon, and bringing them

¹ In Eccles. i. 4 *bô* is used for to come forth, appear, or be born (Fürst).

² When a blind man in Dickens's *Barnaby Rudge* (ch. xlv.) says that sometimes he has the sun as a guide 'and sometimes a milder one at night, but she is *idle* now,' the moon being 'idle' is almost equivalent to the Heb. 'standing.'

³ In the Assyrian astronomical calendars 'the sun goes' seems to mean that he shines; *e.g.* 'On the 30th day no mists. The Moon its path directs and the Sun during the day goes' (*Records of the Past*, vol. i. p. 162).

to a stay nearly all the day long. Combining these two accounts, which mutually explain each other, we infer that not only did the hailstones do immense execution amongst the Amorites, but at the same time an extraordinary and long-continued darkness at noon-day contributed to the consternation and total destruction of their forces. And so this event, though *natural* in the means employed, yet *supernatural* in the direction and overruling of those means in answer to the prayer of faith, corresponds to the miraculous hail and thick darkness which were sent as plagues upon the Egyptians. It is important to observe, moreover, that though we often read in Holy Scripture of darkness, and tempest, and hail being made the ministers of Divine vengeance, as being indeed the natural types of wrath and dread (*e.g.* Gen. xix. 16; Ps. xviii. 11-14; Is. xlii. 10), in no instance do we find the cheerful light of day so employed. *That* is rather the natural symbol of favour and blessing (*e.g.* Job xxii. 28; Ps. xcvi. 11).

It should be borne in mind, too, that this people with whom Joshua was battling near Ajalon were worshippers of the sun and the moon; and there was actually a mountain on this very spot called *Har-cheres*, 'Mountain of the Sun' (Judges i. 35), while the town of Beth-shemesh, 'House of the Sun,' lay hard by, and Jericho, 'the Moon City,' a little further off—all no doubt head-quarters of the old Canaanitish worship of the heavenly bodies.

To idolators of this description it would certainly seem a much more ominous and disastrous event if their god suddenly withdrew his countenance from them in the hour of need, than if he merely continued to shine beyond his wonted period. When the solar deity who had spoken encouragement and hope to them in the brightness of the morning suddenly became 'silent' and 'still' at noonday, they would fear, in the words of Elijah's famous taunt, 'peradventure he sleepeth and must be awaked' (1 Kings, xviii. 27). But to all their cries for help 'there was neither *voice*, nor any to answer, nor any that regarded.' His vocal beams continued dumb. If their own reputed gods were thus made to fight against their votaries by a Nemesis similar to that which has been traced in the plagues inflicted on the people of Pharaoh, the whole event certainly appears in a striking light, and gains a new significance. 'Upon their gods also the Lord executed judgments' (Numbers xxxiii. 4).¹

¹ In a remarkable hieroglyphic inscription we find Thothmes III. on his march to do battle with the princes of Palestine using these words in

Roberts in his *Oriental Illustrations* quotes from the Páramam, as somewhat analogous to this defeat, an account of a battle fought by five princes against a hundred, on which occasion Vishnu by intercepting the light of the sun and causing sudden darkness, assisted the one party to conquer the other (p. 135). In the more sober pages of history it is told how even an eclipse before a battle has been enough to strike terror into the hearts of a whole army. Plutarch mentions that on the eve of the battle of Pydna, B.C. 168, the Macedonians were thrown into great consternation by the fact of the moon being then eclipsed (*Life of Paulus Æmilius*). A more striking parallel still is the account given by the same writer of the overthrow of the Carthaginians by Timoleon at the Crimessus. We subjoin it here in the quaint translation of Sir Thomas North, that the reader may compare it for himself:—

‘With great fury he went to give a charge upon them, who valiantly received the first charge, their bodies being armed with good iron corselets and their heads with faire murrions of copper. . . . But when they came to handle their swords, when agilitie was more requisite than force : a fearefull tempest of thunder, and flashing lightning withall, came from the mountaines. After that came darke thicke clouds also (gathered together from the top of the hills) and fell upon the vally, where the battell was fought with a marvellous extreme shower of raine, fierce violent winds, and haile withall. All this tempest was upon the Grecians backs, and full before the barbarous people, beating on their faces, and did blindfold their eyes, and continually tormented them with the raine that came full upon them with the wind, and the lightnings so oft flashing amongst them, that one understood not another of them. Which did marvellously trouble them, and specially those that were but fresh-water souldiers, by reason of the terrible thunderclaps, and the noise the boisterous wind and haile made upon their harness : for that made them they could not heare the order of their Captaines. Moreover, the dirt did as much annoy the Carthaginians, because they were not nimble in their armour, but heavily armed as we have told you : and besides that also, when the plaies of their coates were through wet with water, they did lode and hinder them so much the more, that they could not fight with any ease. This stood the Grecians to great purpose to throw them down the easier. . . . So in the end they being overcome with the storme that still did beat upon them, and the

‘the valley of Aaruna’ (= Ajalon, Dr. S. Birch) : ‘I am the beloved of the Sun, praised by my father Amen, renewed by the Sun with life. I will go on this road of Aaruna, if there is any going on it. . . . Call they [? us] abominable opposers of the Sun’ (*Records of the Past*, vol. ii. pp. 39, 40). It would seem: here that Egyptians and Canaanites vied with each other in invoking the assistance of the sun-god in the day of battle.

Grecians having slain of their men at the first onset, to the number of four hundred of their choicest men, who made the first front of their battell : all the rest of their army turned their backs immediately, and fled for life. In so much as some of them being followed very nere, were put to the sword in the midst of the vally : other, holding one another hard by the arms together, in the midst of the river as they passed over, were caried downe the streame and drowned with the swiftnesse and violence of the river. But the greatest number, thinking by footmanship to recover the hills thereabouts, were overtaken by them that were light armed, and put to the sword every man' (*Lives of the Noble Grecians*, &c. fol. p. 279, ed. 1612).

We can understand from this account how readily the issue of a conflict, fought under somewhat similar local conditions, might be determined at a critical moment by an adverse state of the elements.¹

If we duly weigh the considerations so far advanced it may seem perhaps not unreasonable to suggest that this miracle was one of protracted darkness rather than of protracted light. At the same time no such total failure of light is to be conceived as would have incapacitated both pursuers and pursued alike for maintaining the combat, and indeed would rather have befriended the weaker party by enabling them to steal away under cover of the darkness. The appearance, we may suppose, was that of preternatural gloom, such as some-

¹ An extraordinary darkness which occurred while the battle of Evesham was being fought is recorded by Robert of Gloucester, and is piously attributed by him to the fact that 'Jesu Crist wel vuele ipaied was (very ill pleased was), As he ssewede bitokninge grisliche & gode.'

'In the Norþ West a derk weder þer aros,
Sodeinliche suart inou, that mani man agros,
& over caste it þorȝe al þut lond, þat me miȝte vnneþe ise.
Crisloker weder þan it was ne miȝte an erþe be.' P. 560.

Humboldt mentions a remarkable obscuration of the sun's disc during which the stars were seen at mid-day, that took place about the time of the battle of Muhlberg in 1547. Similar obscurations in 1090 and 1203—the one for three, and the other for six, hours—have been attributed to passage of meteoric masses between the earth and the sun (*Cosmos*, vol. i. p. 121, ed. Bohn). Xenophon records that when Larissa was besieged by the King of the Persians, 'a cloud having come over the sun it disappeared to the extent that the inhabitants forsook the place, and thus it was taken.' This was a partial eclipse of the sun B.C. 557 (*Trans. of Soc. of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. i. p. 201). 'These late eclipses in the sun and moon portend no good to us' (*Lear*, i. 2, 112) was indeed the general feeling of antiquity (see De Rougemont, *Le Peuple Primitif*, i. 468; Pictet, *Origines Indo-Européens*, ii. 584; Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic*, 208; Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, i. 296; Lubbock, *Orig. of Civilization*, 136). This solution, however, cannot be offered for the miracle at Beth-horon, as both sun and moon being then visible they could not be in conjunction.

times occurs at mid-day, heralding the outpouring of a violent tempest—when the very sun seems blotted from the skies and all nature seems sick with eclipse. This phenomenon, always awe-inspiring and suggestive of fearful forebodings, especially when long continued, would have a powerful tendency to increase the panic of a superstitious host already wavering, and to render them passive victims in the hands of a bold and elated band of warriors. And it is by no means impossible that the same natural appearance which struck dismay into the one army may have lent new courage to the other. The Assyrians, for example, appear to have sometime regarded an eclipse of the sun as a favourable omen. Thus Assur-nasir-pal mentions in his Annals, 'In my first campaign, when the Sun-god, guider of the lands, threw over me his beneficent protection (or shade), on the throne of my dominion I firmly seated myself,' where the allusion is supposed to be to the eclipse of July 13, B.C. 885.¹ In another tablet a later monarch records, 'In the month of Tammuz an eclipse darkened [lit. changed the colour of] the Ruler of the Day, the Lord of Light. And for three days the evening sun was darkened as on that day. To the king of Elam this betokened his death, but to me it was the best of omens and it did not fail.' The reference here, according to M. Oppert, is to the eclipse of June 27, B.C. 661.² At Beth-horon, moreover, the obscuration was expected and prayed for by the leader of the Israelites, and must therefore, when granted, have been regarded as a manifest token of the favour and help of the Almighty (compare Jer. x. 2). If any difficulty should be felt with regard to the statement of v. 14, 'there was no day like that before it or after it,'³—as if this necessarily takes the event out of the category of all other miracles of a terrestrial or atmospherical character, and therefore implies some remarkable intervention in the regularity of the solar system—the

¹ *Records of the East*, vol. iii. p. 43.

² *Transactions of the Soc. of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. i. p. 349.

³ As an instance how prone men are to read their own meanings into the words of Scripture the Vulgate rendering of this clause is observable: 'Non fuit antea nec postea tam *longa* dies,' whereas the Hebrew says nothing about the length of the day, but merely 'there was not (any) like this day, either before it or after it.' The Talmud feigns that the sun and moon stood still for 36 hours, because it was the eve of the Sabbath, which would otherwise have been broken (J. Lightfoot, *Works*, vol. x. p. 549, ed. Pitman). An Anglo-Saxon manual of Astronomy says that 'the sun stood one day's length above the town Gabaon through the prayer of the thane Joshua,' and thence originated the *bissexstus*, or intercalated day, in leap year (*Pop. Treatises on Science in Mid. Ages*, p. 13, ed. Wright).

answe
to tr
mem
voice
was c
cloud
34), v
in va
the f
and i
which
the d

V
obje
again

I
fight
full
stand
scare
to th

2
peris
Was
main
foll
The
rem
easi

mo
whe
is c
of
till
he s
and
as a
imp
the
dar
is, v

par
diff

answer is supplied by the writer himself, who has not omitted to tell us in *what* respect this day was unique and ever memorable; viz. that then 'the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.' Then for the first time the challenge, which was once given to Job, 'Canst thou lift up thy voice to the clouds, that abundance of waters may cover thee?' (xxxviii. 34), was taken up by a man of faith, and was not taken up in vain. At the supplication of his servant the Lord made the firmament to bow and come down; 'He sent darkness and it was dark,' and laid open 'the treasures of the hail, which He has reserved against the time of trouble, against the day of battle and war' (Job. xxxviii. 23).

We now proceed to consider further whether more serious objections do not lie against the ordinary interpretation than against that we have proposed.

1. Joshua and his men had been marching all night and fighting since the break of day. The enemy were now in full flight before them. Is it probable, under such circumstances, that his earnest aspiration would be that the day, *scarcely yet half expired*, should be supernaturally extended to the length of two?

2. Besides, a large number of the routed host had already perished from the hailstones, and it was still high noon. Was it a likely thought to occur to Joshua, that in the remaining half of the day he would not have ample time to follow up the victory already gained, and cut off the fugitives? The crisis of the battle was over; why should not the even remainder of a natural day suffice for the completion of the easier portion of his task?

3. Would it not have been superfluous to desire that the *moon* as well as the sun should prolong her light in the skies, when at mid-day she could be but faintly seen, if at all? It is conceivable indeed that an impetuous soldier in the heat of battle might express a wish that the sun might never set, till he had annihilated his enemies to the last man; but that he should take account of the ghostly reflex of the moon, and pray that her ineffectual light might also be continued as auxiliary to that of the sun, strikes us as in a high degree improbable. On the other hand, his aspiration, according to the present exegesis, that the heavens might be so completely darkened that not even the 'lesser light' could be discerned, is, we submit, natural and appropriate.

4. If this amazing miracle, of a character altogether unparalleled, indeed took place as commonly understood, it is difficult to explain why there is no distinct reference to it in

other parts of scripture—even when some reference was fairly to be expected. For instance, the Prophet Isaiah (xxviii. 21) ranges this victory of Joshua side by side with the victory of David over the Philistines at Perazim (1 Chron. xiv. 11), as of commensurate importance, but he says nothing of the sun standing still. We should certainly have looked for some mention of this event in the Epistle to the Hebrews, ch. xi., where the writer alludes to Joshua as a man of exemplary faith. He refers to the capture of Jericho, but says nothing of the two great ‘powers of heaven,’ the ruler of the day and the ruler of the night, having been through faith made obedient to his word: an instance, we should have thought, much more important for his purpose. ‘The inference is that although there certainly was a miracle in the matter, it was understood by the sacred writers to be something far less stupendous than later and more literal interpreters have been led to imagine.’¹

5. One passage there is which certainly does appear at first sight to lend support to the received interpretation. The passage we mean is in Habakkuk iii. 11, where, among other convulsions of nature produced by the anger of the Lord, it is stated ‘the sun and moon *stood still* in their habitation.’ The true rendering of the Hebrew there, however, is something very different, as Keil and Delitzsch have shown, viz. ‘the sun and moon *entered into their habitation*’; that is to say, they withdrew their light and were obscured, as if they had returned into the place whence they had come forth. It seems in fact the natural antithesis to ‘go on,’ the expression in Josh. x. 13, meaning to resume his course, or shine again. ‘The words cannot mean to stand still in the sky’ (Keil).² This passage, therefore, so far from favouring the ordinary view, rather corroborates that which we have endeavoured to establish, viz., that the miracle was one of prolonged *darkness*, and not of prolonged light, and that it thus constituted a literal fulfilment of what is announced in many parts of Scripture, that when the Lord comes in judgment upon his foes, the sun and moon shall be darkened; as in Amos viii. 9, ‘It shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord God, that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in the clear day.’³ (Compare Is. xiii. 10, Ezek. xxxii. 7, Joel ii. 10, Matt. xxiv. 29).

¹ Kitto, *Pictorial Bible*, in loco.

² *Minor Prophets*, vol. ii. p. 108, ed. Clark. Comp. colloquial English, ‘the sun has gone in.’

³ This predicted darkness at noon-day has been identified with the

where

moti

Book

his m

(see

Line

gate

all t

work

by t

buria

a fict

of Jo

still

2

ortho

terp

renc

truth

not

and

wish

othe

had

acco

quir

upon

of so

This

Kurt

p. 23

Chur

Dr. I

quot

solar

Can

p. 15

1

appe

to sta

This

of Jo

made

2

A few words in conclusion as to the various interpretations which have been given of this passage.

1. A literal standing still of the sun in his daily apparent motion across the sky was understood by the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus, xlv. 4, 'Did not the sun go back by his means? and was not one day as long as two?'; the Rabbins (see *The Conciliator of Manasseh Ben Israel*, vol. ii. p. 12, ed. Lindo); Josephus, *Antiq.* V. i. 17; the Septuagint; the Vulgate;¹ Justin Martyr; Tertullian; and, so far as we remember, all the Greek and Latin Fathers. It is not mentioned in the works of the Apostolic Fathers (ed. Dressel). The Rabbins by transposing *serah* in Timnath-serah, the name of Joshua's burial-place, discovered *cheres*, 'the sun,' and on this grounded a fiction that the image of the sun was fixed upon the sepulchre of Joshua, in remembrance of the sun's miraculous standing still by his word (J. Lightfoot, *Works*, vol. x. p. 303).

2. In modern times all the most able German theologians, orthodox as well as rationalistic, surrendering the ancient interpretation as untenable, have agreed in regarding the occurrence as one purely subjective. They suppose that the actual truth was that Joshua ardently desired that the sun should not go down till the defeat of the Amorites was complete, and that God granted his desire by giving him *what* he wished for, though not *in the way* he may have wished; in other words, He did not allow the day to end till the Israelites had avenged them on their adversaries, enabling them to accomplish as much in *one* day as ordinarily would have required *two*. Thus what is recorded is the impression produced upon Joshua: the sun seeming to stand still, in consequence of so much having been achieved between noon and sunset! This is the view, with more or less variety of detail, of Keil, Kurtz, Maurer, Hengstenberg, Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, vol. ii. p. 235), Grotius (*Poli Synopsis, in loco*), also Stanley (*Jewish Church*, vol. i. p. 207 *seq.*), Kalisch (*Bible Studies*, ii. 209). Dr. Espin (in the *Speaker's Commentary*) strangely regards the quotation from the Book of Jasher as an interpolation,² and

solar eclipse of June 15, B.C. 763, which is mentioned in the Assyrian Canon of Nineveh (*Transactions of Soc. of Biblical Archaeology*, vol. ii. p. 154). But see Pusey, *Minor Prophets*, p. 216.

¹ The name Jokim in 1 Chron. iv. 22, is translated in the Vulgate and appears in the strange form 'qui stare fecit solem,' he who made the sun to stand, where the Targum also finds a reference to the 'seed of Joshua.' This interpretation seems to have originated in some misunderstanding of Jokim, more fully Joakim or Jehoiakim, which means 'Jehovah hath made to stand,' or 'set up.'

² As David's 'bow-song,' or lament for Saul and Jonathan, some 400

Colenso omits it from what he terms 'the original story' of the Book of Joshua (*On the Pentateuch*, &c. pt. vi. p. 277).

3. A third interpretation, that the reflected and refracted light of the sun was continued in the sky after his orb had set (Spinoza, Kitto, Wordsworth), need only be mentioned. The supporters of this view are obliged to regard the horizon as the middle of the heavens!

Between the uncritical literalism of the ancients, which involves a seemingly unnecessary and lavish expenditure of miracle, and the sceptical naturalism of the moderns, which subverts the historical character of the narrative and quite eliminates the miraculous element, the view here advanced, we are willing to think, occupies a happy mean.¹ We do not explain away the words of the original record, but interpret them in the spirit of a sober exegesis which derives support from the discoveries of comparative philology. We hold that the victory of Joshua was, in the truest sense, supernatural, being achieved by agencies, not in themselves transcending the ordinary course of nature, but overruled and directed by the immediate interposition of the Almighty.² Insomuch that the Israelites themselves plainly perceived, and thankfully acknowledged, that the victory had been gained, not by their own strength, nor yet through any accidental coincidence of a timely thunderstorm, but by 'the strong hand and stretched out arm' of Almighty God, Who Himself 'fought for Israel' (v. 14), by making the winds His messengers and the lightning fires His ministers (Ps. civ. 4). The God of nature once more gave assurance to His people that 'the world fighteth for the righteous' (*Wisdom of Solomon*, xvi. 17). 'He commandeth the sun, and it riseth not; and sealeth up the stars' (Job ix. 7).

The passage in its generally received acceptation has often been seized on by the enemies of the Faith as a weapon ready to their hand in their assault upon Revelation. It was once pressed into the service of the ignorant opposers of scientific discovery as a sufficient refutation of the Copernican years later, was also incorporated in the Book of Jasher (2 Sam. i. 18), it is probable that additions were made from time to time to the ancient collection of national songs (cf. Keil, *Introd. to Old Test.* i. 211 ed. Clark); but the nucleus of the book may have been of great antiquity. This is the answer to the objection raised by a writer in *The Biblical Repository*, Jan. 1845, p. 97.

¹ An explanation of the passage agreeing in some respects with that here advanced had been already suggested by Mr. George Warington, in his excellent little volume, *Can we Believe in Miracles?*

² Here, as elsewhere, the Hebrew Scriptures recognize no chance and no secondary causes, 'Omnia etiam quæ naturaliter fiunt, Deus facere dicitur qui naturam et facit,' Grotius, in *Jonah*, iv. 7.

systeme
and
men
doubt
shake
never
pathy
advan
perso
has t
trans
at all
thoug
fect
expr
and
infer
migh
suffic
doubt
nothi
sad l
this a
shall
nation
Wor
T
son v
the c
that
sun r
[step
to be
violet
and
for a
back
of th
that
than
ward
(2 K
uses
shade
was i
VO

system of astronomy. It still arouses sometimes questionings and searchings of heart among that large class of educated men and women who *want* to believe, and would fain have no doubts and reservations, and yet cannot smother these nor shake them quite off. This class of unsatisfied Christians, never larger than at present, is one deserving of all the sympathy and help that we can give them. If what has been here advanced should serve to make plain to any such candid persons that at least one great difficulty in the Bible, which has troubled so many minds, only exists really in our fallible translations and commentaries, and is not necessarily implied at all by the original record; and that in consequence of the thoughts of God being conveyed through a medium so imperfect as the words of man, it is the mere human form of expression that is chargeable with the difficulty as it stands; and if, as the further result of this inquiry, it may fairly be inferred that other dark and enigmatical passages in the Bible might be made clear by similar treatment, if we only had sufficient knowledge—so that the true answer to many of our doubts and difficulties is 'we are of yesterday, and know nothing;' and if thus a burden should be lifted from even one sad but earnest heart, which God hath not made sad, then this article will not have been without useful results, and we shall have been justified in submitting afresh to critical examination this historical portion of what we hold to be God's Word.

The only other event which can be brought into comparison with Joshua's miracle is the returning of the shadow on the dial of Ahaz at the word of the prophet Isaiah. In that miraculous sign given to King Hezekiah when 'the sun returned ten degrees [literally 'steps'], by which degrees [steps] it was gone down' (Is. xxxviii. 8), few will be content to believe now, with the ancient Fathers, that there was a violent disturbance or reversal of the cosmical laws of nature, and that not only the motion of the earth on its axis was for a short period arrested, but that it was made to revolve backwards from east to west producing an apparent motion of the sun for that period from west to east. It is noticeable that the older narrative of the Book of Kings says no more than that 'the Lord brought *the shadow* ten degrees backward by which it had gone down in the dial [steps] of Ahaz' (2 Kings, xx. 11); while it is sufficiently evident that Isaiah uses the popular language of the time, and, inasmuch as the shadow implies sunshine, and sunshine involves the sun, it was natural to speak of the retrogression of the *sun* when the

retrogression of the *shadow* was really the thought uppermost in his mind. The 'dial' appears to have been a series of steps or stairs (Heb. *ma'alôth*, LXX, *βαθμοί*, and so Joseph. *Antiq.* x. ii. 1) on which the time was roughly indicated by the shadow of a pillar or some elevated object falling upon them. On these the sunlight returned, and the shadow which had moved away from ten of the steps was made to traverse them again. Such an appearance might be the result of a miraculous refraction of the rays of the sun produced by God at the prayer of the prophet (so Delitzsch and Keil). A phenomenon of this nature is recorded to have been observed by Romuald, prior of Metz, in 1703, when owing to a peculiar refraction of the solar light the shadow of a sun-dial actually went back an hour and a half (Kitto, Keil). The miracle moreover was intended to be a sign to King Hezekiah and not to the world or universe at large. It was essentially a personal and local miracle for the conviction of one king and his court. The deputation from Babylon, the chief seat of astronomical science, knew nothing of it, but 'were sent unto him to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land' (2 Chron. xxxii. 31). We may therefore assume with confidence that no retrogression of the sun, due to a reversal of the earth's rotation, is intended to be conveyed by the sacred record, but merely such a recession of the shadow on the steps as would have been occasioned if the sun had actually moved backward. Here then, as at the battle of Beth-Horon, the miraculous element consisted in a rare phenomenon of nature being accurately produced at a given moment for a definite purpose by the word of God's prophet. This was also the view of the learned Bochart, who states the matter as follows:—

'Per miraculum ingens, ad confirmandum Ezechiam in fide divinæ promissionis de vitæ prorogatione, umbra retrocessit decem gradibus per quos jam descenderat. Umbram aio, non Solem ipsum, quia nihil in Scriptura reperiō quod nos cogat ut credamus Solem ipsum retrocessisse. In historia Regum de Sole nihil habetur. Solum umbra legitur reversa esse retrorsum. In Esaia etiam Deus pollicetur duntaxat se facturum ut umbra regrediatur decem gradibus, unde explicanda sequentia; *Et reversus est Sol decem gradibus*. Sol, id est, umbra Solis, vel etiam lumen Solis, quod recedenti umbræ successit. Eo sensu Sol accedere dicitur, prout Solis lumen accedit aut recedit. Itaque miraculum fuit in heliotropio: non in ipso corpore Solis' (*Opera*, tom. iii. col. 411, ed. 1692).

It has also been suggested that the 'sign' was effected by the movement of the shadow during the solar eclipse of

Janu
it is
over
vol.

1. P
2. S
3. L

THE
lishe
Chri
as a
whic
dwe
whic
was
vary
qual
unec
late
had
in o
exce
We
thre
Pete

we l
auth
Chu
ben
Cyp
in t
con

January 11, B.C. 689, which was visible at Jerusalem. This, it is said, would recede with a deliberate motion extending over twenty minutes (*Trans. of the Soc. of Biblical Archæology*, vol. iii. p. 36).

ART. V.—THREE DIOCESAN HISTORIES.

1. *Peterborough.* By the Rev. GEORGE AYLIFFE POOLE, M.A., Rector of Winwick. (London, 1883.)
2. *Selsey. Chichester.* By the Rev. W. R. W. STEPHENS, Rector of Woolbeding. (London, 1881.)
3. *Lichfield.* By the Rev. WILLIAM BERESFORD, Vicar of S. Luke's, Leek. (London, 1883.)

THE plan of a series of 'Diocesan Histories,' to be published under the auspices of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, was naturally attractive to Churchmen as appealing to that limited but real form of religious loyalty which centres in the chair of each individual bishop, and dwells fondly on those special lines of Church development which distinguish historically the area of his charge. But it was a plan which could not be carried into execution without varying degrees of success; partly because of the different qualifications of the workers, but also partly because of the unequal interest attaching to the several dioceses. We lately noticed an instance in which a diocese of great dignity had been very fortunate in its historian. Canon Ormsby, in our opinion, had well fulfilled the requisite conditions in his excellent history of the metropolitan diocese of the North. We now purpose to give our readers some little account of three other volumes of this series, those which are devoted to Peterborough, to Chichester, and to Lichfield.

I. Mr. Poole's *Diocesan History of Peterborough* appeared, we believe, but a short time before the death of the respected author, which closed a long career of services rendered to the Church. It is forty-three years since Mr. Poole, then incumbent of S. James's, Leeds, published his useful *Life of S. Cyprian*, which we mention here as a specimen of his activities in the field of theological literature. Of his last work we feel constrained to say that it bears some traces of failing vigour:

the execution is slighter and less accurate than might have been expected some years ago. It is true, indeed, that one who has to write of a diocese which had no proper diocesan history before the sixteenth century, and which since its constitution has had very few distinguished prelates, is under a temptation to fill up his space by observations on well-known points in the general history of the Church which have rather an accidental than a vital connexion with that district. Thus Mr. Poole gives rather a disproportionate place in his narrative to the contests of Anselm and Becket with the kings of their time, merely on account of the assemblies held at Rockingham and at Northampton. Thus, because Wycliffe was rector of Lutterworth, we have, at page 95, the scene in S. Paul's between his royal backer, John of Gaunt, and Bishop Courtney, which certainly belongs to a 'diocesan history of London.' Thus, because Latimer was 'born at Thirkesson,' of Leicestershire yeoman blood, we have some rather familiar quotations from his Lent sermons before the King. Thus, because White of Peterborough was one of the 'seven Bishops,' we have a description—certainly not a lengthy one—of their trial, and even a quotation of the Cornish 'refrain' about Bishop Trelawney, and an account of Ken's speech when summoned, as a representative of Nonjuring prelates, before the Privy Council in 1695. This will have to be repeated by the historian of Bath and Wells. One may wish that Mr. Poole had somewhat oftener borne in mind what occurs to him at page 151, in reference to the Travers and Hooker controversy: 'All this may not seem to concern our diocese in particular.'

In the earlier portion of the history of the district, Mr. Poole seems to have but inadequately utilized the existing materials; and especially he has overlooked the important contribution made by Dr. Stubbs in his paper on *The Foundation and Early Fasti of Peterborough* (1861). For otherwise he would have dwelt somewhat more on 'the missionary spirit' in Penda and other children of the grim old pagan Penda. 'Bede,' says Dr. Stubbs, 'omitting all mention of the royal family' (of Mercia, in reference to the origin of Medeshamstede, now Peterborough), 'ascribes the foundation to Saxulf, the first abbot; still, knowing the character of the Mercian princes and the uniformity of the tradition, we may conclude that Saxulf was not without their aid in his good work.' 'Medeshamstede, founded on the edge of the marsh or fen-country,' was principally a 'missionary station, though with great facilities for retreat.'

Mr. Poole somewhat disparages the descriptive powers of the earliest Peterborough chronicler, Hugo Candidus, so called because of the pallor left by severe illness. But he might have enlivened his earlier pages by samples of local patriotism, such as Hugo's panegyric on 'locum tam egregium, tam perspicuum, tam amœnum, . . . atque fertilissimum et jocundissimum, omnibusque rebus uberrimum et formosissimum, et quasi paradisum in terris,' 'as it were offered by God to' the founders of this house of S. Peter. It is somewhat strange to find the story of the massacre of monks at Croyland—all but little Turgar—told again at this time of day without a word of caution, as though the authority of the pseudo-Ingulf were unquestionable (p. 29). Mr. Freeman says of it, 'Everyone knows the legendary but highly interesting story in the false Ingulf. It may have some foundation in fact; but if so, it is strange to find no mention of it in Orderic' (*Norm. Conq.* iv. 596). Dr. Stubbs is more positive: 'The fact that no mention is made of the circumstances so detailed either by Orderic or Malmesbury, or by the industrious later compilers, is, in my opinion, fatal' (*Fasti of Peterb.* p. 16). Mr. Poole's judgment as to legendary tales of wonder in Bede or other such writers is at once sober and sympathetic, although we think it an infelicitous use of Matt. v. 21 to describe 'the voice of legend' as '*It was said by them of old time*' (p. 20). These authors, he says, wrote *bond fide*; they saw Divine interventions where we should see 'the ordinary sequence of events;' we may 'accept' their 'testimony,' while we sometimes demur to 'their' inferences; 'with our altered habits of thought we arrive at different conclusions from the same premisses. But we are one with them in the Body of Christ; . . . we cannot, if we would, dissociate ourselves from Columba, and Aidan, and Finan, and Chad, and Saxulf; and certainly, if we rightly understand their place in the history of the Church, we would not if we could' (p. 24). But 'yet the evil that crept into this devotion to relics, the too ready acceptance of wonderful stories, should teach us reverence for truth, and loyalty to common sense, without which we shall certainly be led into folly,' and such folly as must bring 'its own curse with it,' as it did of old, 'in an utter disregard for truth,' in such forgeries, for instance, as those of the privilege-grants of Popes Vitalian and Agatho to Medeshamstede, which are said to have drawn tears of joy from King Edgar.

Mr. Poole mentions Wilfrid with due honour; but what is his authority for calling him 'a native of Ripon'?

There is another slip in the same page, where Colman of Lindisfarne is called Bishop of York. Really the story of Oswy's speech about the heavenly Doorkeeper need not have been told once again in reference to Peterborough; but Mr. Poole might have said that, when Ethelwold of Winchester, in Edgar's reign, came to Medeshamstede, he 'found nothing but old walls and wild woods' (*Ang.-Sax. Chron.* A.D. 964), the ruined church being turned into a cattle shed (Candidus, in Sparke's Collection, p. 17); and when he says that, at the solemn confirmation of its former privileges and possessions by Edgar, this place, already called Burgh, came to be known as Gildenburgh, or Goldenburgh, in consequence of the rich offerings there presented, we may observe that the *Saxon Chronicle* (in its 'Peterborough' form) tells us that Abbot Kenulf first walled in the monastery, and then gave it the name Burgh, and, like Candidus, connects 'the name of 'Goldenburgh' with the abbacy of the munificent Leofric. That 'mighty abbot of the Golden Borough,' as Freeman calls him in his sonorous way, receives due honour from our historian; but his name suggests a divergence to the story of Earl Leofric and Godiva, with even a footnote of indignation against the later myth of 'Peeping Tom' (p. 33). When at page 24 we read, 'Egelric was the last abbot of the Saxon era,' we can only suppose him to mean 'Leofric.' The weird story of Egelric's dream, and of the devil's three menaces (two of which, writes Candidus, had been fulfilled—might God avert the fulfilment of the third!), is given somewhat later, at page 46. Mr. Poole omits to explain that Egelric, after resigning the see of Durham, returned to Peterborough and lived there quietly for several years. He might have explained also that after Leofric died, on November 1, 1066, Brand received investiture in the abbacy from Edgar Atheling; and whereas he says that Brand 'was unmolested until the year 1069, when William gave the abbey to one Thorold,' the fact is that Brand died in November of that year, and Thorold succeeded in the following April. A good deal more might have been made of the attack of Hereward and his Danish allies on the monastery, which Mr. Poole describes in a few cold lines, contrasting rather unluckily with Mr. Freeman's account (*Norm. Conq.* iv. 458). He might have shown us, after Candidus, the fierce fight at 'Bulehithe or Bulldyke' gate, the irruption of the professed champions of English nationality, the wild scenes within the church when 'the outlaws climbed up to the holy rood,' tried to pull it down, and did tear away

'the
Chro
altar
it sa
of th
king
by t
to P
the
was
out
kept
who
unde

and
abbo
is a
calls
the
John
by I
pois
that
acqu
this
or a
adv
Her
give
he l
Bur
Pete
com
retu
that
goo

abb
after
Yet
'cur
...
resp
'alw

'the crown of beaten gold from our Lord's head' (*Sax. Chron.*), and when a rich 'table' that stood before the altar was carried off, the Danes saying that they could keep it safer than the Frenchmen (*Candidus*). Of the great relic of the abbey, the incorruptible right arm of the bounteous king, S. Oswald, Mr. Poole says (p. 22) that it was 'rescued by the prior, carried to the Isle of Ely, and at last restored to Peterborough.' This hardly gives a correct impression: the arm ('super omne aurum preciosum,' says *Candidus*) was carried by the Danes to Ely, and there secretly taken out of its *feretrum* by the prior, whom they trusted, and who kept it under his pillow, and sent it to the monks of Ramsey, who were afterwards compelled to restore it to Peterborough under a threat from abbot Thorold to burn their monastery.

After describing the abbacy of the great builder Ernulf, and of the too-choleric John de Seez, Mr. Poole comes to an abbot whom he calls 'Henry of Anjou (de Angelis).' This is a confusion. The author of the *Chronicon Petroburgense* calls him 'abbas Andegavensis ecclesiæ'; but *Candidus* and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* say that he had been abbot of S. John of Angely, the monastery whose abbot was referred to by Louis XI., in his prayer to Our Lady of Cléry, as the poisoner of his brother Charles of Guienne. Mr. Poole says that, 'as Henry "lived as a drone in the hive,"' we shall acquit him of all deeds worth mentioning.' But although this abbot, according to *Candidus*, did no good at Angely or at Peterborough, he was a man of resource, and his adventures at least are worthy of some record. He deceived Henry I. into giving him Peterborough although he had not given up Angely. Afterwards, while on a visit to France, he lost Angely, promised the monks of Cluny to 'subject Burgh to them,' failed in this attempt, and tried to secure Peterborough for his nephew Gerard; but the King, having come to understand him, bade him leave England. He returned to Angely; and the charitable *Candidus* remarks that he was at least 'bonus eleemosynator,' and 'made a good end.'

Martin de Vecti, in Stephen's reign, is another remarkable abbot, of whom Mr. Poole tells us little beyond two dates, after a whole chapter on the Pontificale and the Regale. Yet Martin was a man of many troubles and great energy: 'cum magno labore . . . abbatiam suam in *guerris* tenuit . . . magnæ strenuitatis vir;' and withal much loved and respected, although he had begun rather badly. He was 'always at work in the church or in the monastic buildings.'

'He made many monks,' says the *Saxon Chronicle*, 'and planted a vineyard, and made many works, and rendered the town better than it *ere* was; and was a good monk and a good man, and therefore God and good men loved him.' In his time the new choir of the church was opened for service, on the feast of the patron Apostle. Mr. Poole says, 'We are not, however, told anything of the ceremonial on this occasion.' But we *are*: for Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, displayed the arm of S. Oswald, and blessed the people with it. Mr. Poole is much more diffuse on Abbot Benedict of Canterbury, who, says Swapham, in his *Chronicle*, built 'totam navem ecclesie a turre chori usque ad frontem.' After his appointment, as Dean Stanley has told us in his *Memorials of Canterbury*, Benedict enriched his new minster with some relics of Becket, and made two altars out of flag-stones from the scene of 'the martyrdom.' In building he was 'valde strenuus, semper intentus;' but he was also, as Mr. Poole says, 'a literary abbot,' and set the transcribers to work on volumes of 'Scripture with glosses,' and on many other books, being a well-read man, 'sapientiâ sæculari plenissime eruditus.' Mr. Poole might as well have perpetuated the good Robert Swapham's eulogy: 'Under him in the convent was joy and peace, in his house nobleness . . . and exultation, . . . plenty of meat and drink, . . . and at the gate a cheerful, unmurmuring reception of strangers.' He was the 'familiar friend' of Richard I.; and Mr. Poole tells us of his proposal to sell all the plate (*i.e.* chalices) of the churches for that very useless King's ransom. Abbot Lindsey's good works within the precinct—including, probably, the erection of the magnificent west front—are honourably mentioned; but Swapham tells us also that he exerted himself to restrain the harsh operation of the forest laws, to defend the *vills* on the monastic property, and maintain their old liberties '*coram justiciariis*.' In the next page Mr. Poole uses one of those phrases, not very uncommon with Anglican writers, which by themselves would suggest a one-sided idea: 'Grostête was one of the chief champions of the English Church against the usurpations of Rome.' We hope that none of his readers will infer that the great Bishop of Lincoln did not hold the Papal supremacy. But we may as well quote Milman: 'As a Churchman, Grostête held the loftiest views of the power of the Pope. . . . The Pope has undoubted power to dispose of all benefices; but, for the *abuse* of that power, hell-fire is the doom.' He admitted in principle the binding authority of all 'Apostolical' commands, but he

reser
are
angr
doct
Mr.
by t
add
of il
find
bann
side
abbe
mon
Lew
vict
he h
told
been
'fert
from
suits
alwa
ther
'Ric
Mr.
noti
chro
and
of th
we h
Nov
ject
Gile
is r
Sw
befo
de V
and
The
beg
occ
who
Wh

reserved to himself the right of saying certain commands are not really 'Apostolical.' Innocent IV. was naturally angry, but his 'Cardinals pleaded the Bishop's . . . Catholic doctrine.'¹ In regard to Abbot Sutton, Mr. Poole quotes Mr. Bruce's preface to the *Chronicon Petroburgense* published by the Camden Society in 1849. It would have been easy to add some curious details from Walter de Whitlesey, by way of illustration of the summary there given. For instance, we find Henry III. bursting forth into indignation on 'seeing the banner of S. Peter's monastery displayed on the barons' side against himself and his men:' he vows to ruin both abbot and monastery; he has to be appeased with gifts of money and of a goodly palfrey: yet, after the battle of Lewes, poor Abbot Sutton is not less in peril from the victorious insurgents; and again, after the battle of Evesham, he has to pay heavy fines to the King. One thing, we are told, stood him in good stead: he had always kept food and beer ready for adherents of both parties, so that all who came 'fertiliter erant refecti.' Mr. Poole draws much information from the *Chronicon Petroburgense* as to the innumerable lawsuits of Abbot Richard of London; but his dates are not always quite accurate. In his account of Abbot Godfrey there is a curious slip, repeated twice in one page: for 'Richard II.' read 'Edward II.' We will not pursue further Mr. Poole's history of this great monastic house; but we must notice one or two inaccuracies in his reference to its various chroniclers. In the preface, after speaking of Hugo Candidus and Robert Swapham, he says: 'To Swapham, as chronicler of the abbey, succeeded Abbot John of Calais; and after him we have the anonymous author of the *Chronicon Petroburgense*.' Now, the chronicle of *England*—which Sparke (1723) conjecturally attributed to this Abbot John, but of which Dr. Giles, who re-edited it in 1844, pronounces that its authorship is unascertainable—cannot be said to come in order after Swapham, for Abbot John died in 1262, about eleven years before Swapham; the real continuator of Swapham is Walter de Whitlesey, who begins with the abbacy of Hotot (1246), and ends with that of Godfrey in the reign of Edward II. The *Chronicon Petroburgense*—which begins at the very beginning—becomes important after 1273, and is chiefly occupied, as we have said, with Abbot Richard de London, who then succeeded Sutton. The anonymous continuator of Whitlesey goes on from the abbacy of Godfrey to that of

¹ *Hist. Lat. Chr.* vi. 289-292.

Morcot, who is described as borne by the monks 'in humeris et brachiis' to the high altar (1338).

We shall say but little as to the post-mediæval history of Peterborough, to which Mr. Poole devotes about half of his book. The surrender of the abbey by Abbot Chambers, the reward of that submission by his promotion to the newly-founded bishopric, the base sacrilegiousness of Bishop Scambler, the cautious funeral sermon by Bishop Howland at the interment of Queen Mary Stuart, are mentioned; the sufferings of the royalist Bishop Towers, the ejection of several of the clergymen of the diocese by the Puritan sequestrators, the devastation of the cathedral by Cromwell's troopers in 1643, pass before us in due succession; but we cannot understand why such inordinate space is given to the Gunpowder Treason, nor why, after we have been brought down to the Nonjurors, we are taken back to the accession of Bishop Dove (whom Elizabeth called 'her dove with silver wings') at the beginning of a 'Part VI.,' entitled 'Succession of Bishops,' and then from him to Bishop Cumberland, who 'succeeded White the Nonjuror' in 1691. We might have expected that some reference would be made to Laud's annual accounts of his province, by which it appears that, although Bishops Piers and Lindsell had 'taken very good care' concerning the enforcement of conformity, yet Bishop Dee had 'wrought a great reformation by his care and industry,' so that 'the diocese appeared to be in marvellous good order,' and 'catechizing in the afternoon was generally well observed'; but Bishop Towers, in 1639, craved instruction, not from his metropolitan, but (according to Laud's high-handed use of the Regale) from Charles I. himself, 'whether he should command them to catechize only;' the response of the royal oracle being to the purpose: 'So that catechizing be first duly performed, let them have a sermon after that if they desire it.'¹ The Restoration is almost passed over, although there had been an allusion to Dean Cosin being the first to read the Common Prayer again in his old cathedral, before he was raised to the see of Durham. Nothing is said of Bishop Cumberland's or Bishop Kennett's polemics, and nothing of Bishop Marsh's introduction of German criticism into English theology, nor, we must add, of the famous 'eighty-seven questions' proposed by him to candidates for ordination and licences, which were intended to stamp out Calvinism, but which drew down on the Bishop a

¹ Laud, *Works*, v. 331, 349, 368.

bitter
among
We
touchin
workm
for him
navvies
Mr
tecture
'Eccle
are ful
the acc
Langt
formed
by 'a
tower
chorist
and re
said to
ing M
priest'

II.
ought
could
is not
In 18
siastic
career
righted
ficial t
gold.'
Chryso
of the
(1876)
There
books
rather
details
memb
hand,
monas
includ
langua

bitter attack in the *Edinburgh Review*, since republished among the writings of Sydney Smith.

We are sure that Mr. Poole's readers will appreciate the touching account of Bishop Magee's ministrations to railway workmen in the summer of 1876; which, it seems, procured for him from the men themselves the noble title of 'the navvies' own Bishop.'

Mr. Poole's long-known zeal in the cause of Church architecture finds expression at the end of the volume in some 'Ecclesiological Notes' on the churches of the diocese. They are full of interest; but we would especially call attention to the account of Mr. Hanbury, who became rector of Church Langton exactly a hundred years ago, and in that dull time formed a scheme for superseding his fourteenth-century church by 'a minster' in the form of a Greek cross, with a central tower 435 feet high, and 'with its foundation of chaplains and choristers,' not to speak of other noble provisions for worship and religious education (p. 250). Wycliffe, we may add, is said to have been 'seized with his last illness while celebrating Mass' at Lutterworth. He was attending another priest's celebration.¹

II. *The Diocesan History of Chichester*, published in 1881, ought to have received earlier notice at our hands. There could be no question as to the selection of the historian: it is not every diocese which possesses a Prebendary Stephens. In 1871 he contributed to the literature of ancient ecclesiastical history a luminous and sympathetic narrative of the career of that great saint whose confessorship for Christian righteousness was more glorious to himself, and more beneficial to the Church, than all the eloquence of his 'mouth of gold.' But the author of *The Life and Times of S. John Chrysostom* had more recently put forth a volume of *Memorials of the South Saxon See and Cathedral Church of Chichester* (1876), with which it is natural to compare the present work. There is, indeed, some difference in the scope of these two books; the later one, now before us, is professedly a history rather of the diocese than of the bishopric. Hence several details relating to the episcopal succession and the acts of its members are omitted in the *History*, which, on the other hand, exhibits many facts bearing on the general state of the monasteries and the clerical body in Sussex which were not included in the *Memorials*. To a great extent, indeed, the language of the *Memorials* is adopted, with more or less of

¹ See Dr. Shirley's preface to the *Fasciculi Zizaniorum*, p. xlv.

condensation and abridgment, in the smaller volume. We may give an instance or two:—

Memorials.

‘Ceadwalla, the wild outlaw, the fierce savage, the merciless conqueror, when once converted, becomes a devotee’ (p. 19).

‘What fearful thoughts of the murder of the Archbishop Ælfeah at Canterbury must have thrilled with horror and terror the hearts of the bishop and canons, when they saw the vessels of the “heathen men” sailing across from Wight,’ &c. (p. 29).

‘When they [bishops] came to be foreigners and nominees of a foreign king, they became by position, whatever they might be in character, spiritual governors rather than spiritual fathers, and even in some degree temporal governors. Like other feudal lords, it was natural—almost necessary—that they should reside not in the quiet, secluded village or the open country, but in the chief fortified town of the diocese. The tribal designation is now gradually dropped, and supplanted by the urban, taken from the name of the town where the see is fixed’ (p. 39).

We might similarly compare *Hist.* p. 37, *Mem.* p. 43, on the foundation of the priory of Lewes; *Hist.* p. 58, *Mem.* p. 75, on the probable friendly intercourse between Archbishop Langton and Bishop Neville at Slindon manor; *Hist.* p. 64, *Mem.* p. 87, on the missionary simplicity of S. Richard of Wych, when reduced by Henry III.’s perversity to the condition of a homeless wanderer in his own diocese; and so on. Documents, quoted fully in the larger work, are naturally summarized in the smaller, as in regard to Bishop Storey’s visitation of monasteries (*Mem.* p. 172, *Hist.*

History.

‘The wild outlaw, the fierce conqueror, became a devotee’ (p. 13).

‘The Chapter of Selsey must have trembled, especially after the murder of Archbishop Ælfeah at Canterbury, when they saw the “heathen men” cross year by year from their winter quarters in the Isle of Wight,’ &c. (p. 25).

‘When they came to be foreigners, nominees of a foreign king, and feudal barons of the realm, it was natural—almost necessary—that they should reside no longer in the secluded village or remote manor-houses, but in one of the chief towns of the diocese. Henceforth, too, the tribal designation disappears and is supplanted by the urban’ (p. 35).¹

¹ Yet the tribal title appears in 1129, *Mem.* p. 52.

p. 150)
market
borne’s
observ
sugar,
or the
Henry
cases,
is som
Freema
of Com
scriptio
p. 148
all whe
Hist. p
(*Mem.*
by Bish
had shi
‘the bo
or leg
had no
the sta
cision i
whose
pagans
early B
an offsh
the sta
monks
in *Hist*
S. Rich
dead,’ s
for bur
Amber
(*Hist.*
Bishop
(*Mem.*
elevatio
Mr.
South
among
District
South
confess
glow, th

p. 150), or his indenture with the mayor as to his beautiful market cross (*Mem.* p. 181, *Hist.* p. 151); or Bishop Sherborne's directions for his own 'anniversary' and its due observances, including even a provision of cups of milk, sugar, and egg, for the choristers (*Mem.* p. 188, *Hist.* p. 162); or the despotic silencing for a time of all preachers by Henry VIII. in 1535 (*Mem.* p. 210, *Hist.* p. 177). In a few cases, on the other hand, the account given in the *Memorials* is somewhat simplified, as to the differences (on which Mr. Freeman has insisted) between the localities of English and of Continental bishoprics (*Mem.* p. 22, *Hist.* p. 28), the description of Bishop Ralph Luffa's Norman cathedral (*Mem.* p. 148, *Hist.* p. 43), the penalty imposed by Henry II. on all who should comply with Becket's interdict (*Mem.* p. 61, *Hist.* p. 51), the immunities granted by John to the chapter (*Mem.* p. 70, *Hist.* p. 56), the special irregularities disclosed by Bishop Storey's visitation of the cathedral—*e.g.* 'the dean had shifted images of saints from one chapel to another,' and 'the boys did not cense properly' (*Hist.* p. 149). The story or legend of S. Lewinna, the female martyr (*Hist.* p. 13), had not been mentioned in the *Memorials*. In other cases the statement made in the *Memorials* assumes greater precision in the *History*. Thus the little band of Irish monks, whose ascetic piety had utterly failed to impress the Sussex pagans in 681, are no longer called 'waifs and strays of the early British Church' (*Mem.* p. 8), but described as possibly an offshoot of 'S. Columba's monastery in Ireland' (*Hist.* p. 7); the statement that 'the friars became sturdy beggars, the monks easy-going country gentlemen' (*Mem.* p. 101), is limited in *Hist.* p. 121 by the introduction of the word 'tendency.' S. Richard 'assisted with his own hands in the burial of the dead,' says the first book (p. 87); '. . . in preparing the dead for burial,' says the second (p. 64). For 'the parish church at Amberley' (*Mem.* p. 141) we now read 'the bishop's chapel' (*Hist.* p. 140). The obligation of master and scholars of Bishop Storey's school to attend Mass in S. George's Chapel (*Mem.* p. 183) is qualified by 'or at least to be present at the elevation' (*Hist.* p. 152).

Mr. Freeman has said that 'the ecclesiastical capital of the South Saxons must be satisfied with quite a secondary rank among the episcopal cities of England' (*English Towns and Districts*, p. 374); and of the ecclesiastical history of the South Saxon diocese the most interesting part, it must be confessed, is the beginning. There is the suddenness, the glow, the pathos of a romance in Bede's bright story of Wil-

frid's opportune arrival, as an exile, in that little strip of country, hemmed in by the 'Andredsweald' as by an enchanted forest border, within which the powers of darkness could tyrannize at will. Eighty-four years had passed away since Augustine came, with uplifted cross and sacred picture, to speak of Christ before Ethelbert on the slopes above Minster. And Northumbria and East Anglia had long been splendidly Christianized; and thirty years had passed away since the death of the apostle of Wessex; and the sacred torch, kindled in Northumbria, had flashed its light all through the Midlands; and the obstinate resistance of London and the neighbouring East Saxons had at last been broken down, and even the South Saxon king and his queen were now in the fold of Christ; and still the monks of Canterbury, whenever they thought, if they did think, of the condition of his people at large, might wonder when that darkness would be dispersed. But at last—so they would say when they heard the news—'populus qui ambulabat in tenebris vidit lucem magnam.' Wilfrid had taught the poor 'stupid or timid' barbarians how to procure food for the body, and so had won a hearing for his good tidings of salvation for the soul. Thus began the Christian life of Sussex; thus arose the bishopric now planted at 'Cissa's Castle.' Why Mr. Stephens does not reckon S. Wilfrid as the first Bishop of Selsey, or of the South Saxons, we do not profess to understand. That see ought surely to have its rightful honour as sharing with York in the glory of S. Wilfrid, the rather that, whatever criticisms may be passed on any other parts of a most stirring life, the missionary episcopate in Sussex is confessedly its noblest and purest scene.

'It was a most blessed gift,' says Archdeacon Hannah, 'which enabled him to turn his very disappointments into triumphs. . . . His great missionary influence must have arisen from the singleness of his purpose, the warmth of his resolution, the devotion of his life.'

We quote from a passage of the distinguished Archdeacon's sermon at S. Wilfrid's, Hayward's Heath, as quoted by Mr. F. E. Sawyer in his paper on *S. Wilfrid's Life in Sussex*, reprinted from the *Sussex Archaeological Collections*, vol. xxxiii. It may be as well to say that we use the popular form 'Wilfrid,' just as we should say Frideswide, without prejudice to the superior accuracy of Wilfrith or Frithswyth. Mr. Stephens is more punctilious as to 'Æthelwealh,' 'Æthelberht,' or 'Ælfheah' than (*pace* the great historian of the Norman Conquest) we think it worth while to be. Yet, we

observ
wrote

The
lation
Chiche
by the
Hastin
empha
confor
that se
cities.
Exeter
went fi
strong
man w
had ta
in Brit
He ex
conven
advant
The ca
which
genera
'in no
pletely
and En
chief pa
priests

In no
monast
more p
the gro
(pp. 43
than o
say 'bi
'the pu
terbury
whom
there p
Richard
Canter
only of
S. Edm
played

observe with some satisfaction, he cannot bring himself to write 'Ælfred' or 'Eadward.'

The first effect of the Conquest on Sussex was the translation of the see from Selsey to the old Roman town of Chichester. This was part of a plan deliberately adopted by the Council of London nine years after the battle of Hastings. As we have seen, the Continental bishops were emphatically bishops of cities; and Lanfranc was bent on conforming English bishoprics to this rule. It was ordered that sees should be removed from villages or small towns to cities. Leofric of Crediton had, indeed, removed his see to Exeter in the days of the Confessor; and now Hermann went from Sherborne to Old Sarum, Peter of Lichfield to the stronger town of Chester, and Stigand of Selsey, as Mr. Freeman words it, 'to the town—once the Roman Regnum—which had taken the name of one of the earliest Saxon conquerors in Britain, Cissa, the son of Ælle' (*Norm. Cong.* iv. 416). He expresses some surprise that Lewes was not thought more convenient than Chichester; but Mr. Stephens represents 'the advantages of Chichester' as 'neither few nor small' (p. 37). The *cathedra* was established in a church of S. Peter, from which a community of nuns were dislodged. Speaking generally, Mr. Stephens considers that

'in no part of the country can the Church have been more completely Normanized than in Sussex; and for a time, until Normans and English became fused, nowhere can the gap which divided the chief pastor of the Church from the mass of the people and the native priests (where they remained) have been more keenly felt' (p. 41).

In no diocese, perhaps, was the strong tendency of the great monasteries towards independence of episcopal jurisdiction more pointedly exhibited than in the successful struggle of the great Abbey of 'S. Martin *de bello*' against the bishops (pp. 43, 50); but when Mr. Stephens speaks—as he does more than once—of abbots as being consecrated, he should rather say 'blessed.' He speaks of Bishop Hilary as representing 'the pure ecclesiastic'; but we doubt whether Thomas of Canterbury would have recognized this character in the opponent whom Canon Perry calls a 'vain and empty man.'¹ Then there passes before us the venerable figure of the canonized Richard, the loyal companion of the canonized Edmund of Canterbury; and, to quote Canon Perry again, 'a man not only of profound piety, but, like his friend and first patron S. Edmund, of a truly patriotic and national spirit.' How he played the good pastor while in a state of personal destitution

¹ Perry, *Student's Engl. Ch. Hist.* i. 237.

we have seen in an earlier extract. The words of his will, threatening to demand payment, 'even in the presence of the Most High,' for emoluments of the see withheld by Henry III., struck no awe into a mind that preferred will-worship to promise-keeping; but the debt was discharged by Henry's illustrious son, who also paid several visits to the shrine of the new 'S. Richard.' Bishop Gilbert, in Edward I.'s latter years, was 'the last Bishop of Chichester during the mediæval period whose undivided attention seems to have been given to his diocese.' Bishop Langton's episcopate introduces the subject of the fall of the Templars; and here, in referring to an inventory of a Templar church's furniture, Mr. Stephens mentions 'one temporal and sanctorum' without explanation. A 'temporal' meant that part of the breviary which related to the seasons of the year; 'sanctorum' evidently means the 'proprium sanctorum,' or services for the various saints' days. At p. 133 Bishop Rushoke is said to have been banished to Ireland at the 'downfall' of Richard II., although he died ten years before that king's dethronement. The time of his banishment (1388) was that of the supremacy of the confederate lords who for the time coerced Richard (see *Mem.* p. 121; Lingard, iv. 218).

Mr. Stephens tells us much about the foundation and general condition of Sussex monasteries, and proves that, while great carelessness reigned in the cathedral precincts, and parish priests were often very worldly and very negligent, the records of episcopal visitations exhibit monastic communities, especially the smaller ones, as having greatly degenerated from their ideal. Bishop Praty (acc. 1438), a keen pursuer of Lollards, elicited facts which make it 'clear that most of the smaller monasteries were as ripe for suppression then as they were a hundred years later. The bishops could only patch the evils a little here and there; a complete cure was in the nature of things impossible. . . . A pure and genuine love of monastic life had passed away together with the causes which first called it into existence' (p. 144). And further on he refers to Bishop Sherborne's visitation in 1518 as showing that 'some houses which had hitherto maintained a respectable character were becoming infected with the general corruption' (p. 164). Lest 'corruption,' however, should be taken in too stringent a sense, it may be added that 'the account of Boxgrove' Priory at that time shows nothing worse than an unbecoming love of sports, and a carelessness as to the character of some persons admitted into the community.

It seems hardly correct to say that 'the particulars of the

murder
cord
Story
let u
restor
infirm
the to
the p
inhab
put t
Janua
night
of the
celebr
Reino
very s
becau
of the
was v
ended
1457,
as Mr
at Pau
had b
Steph
'adver
almost
reader
in the
an ext
Robert
Some
given
phenom
have w
might
Pecock
In t
been th
ruling
themsel
macy, h
manufac
was mo
before th
VOL.

murder of Bishop Moleyns at Portsmouth have not been recorded' (p. 145). Archdeacon Wright, in his interesting *Story of the Domus Dei at Portsmouth* (the remains of which, let us say in passing, are now represented by a beautifully restored and well-served 'garrison church,' including the old infirmary and the chapel), shows, by the process for absolving the town of Portsmouth from the guilt of this murder, that the prelate was 'inhumanly and sacrilegiously dragged by the inhabitants out of the church called Domus Dei, and cruelly put to death in the town,' but near the same church (on January 9, 1449). This is also said to have taken place at night; and the Archdeacon fixes the spot on the south-west of the Domus Dei. Moleyns was succeeded by the most celebrated of all the Bishops of Chichester—Reginald or Reinold Pecock; and we are disposed to complain of the very scanty notice which Mr. Stephens bestows on his career, because, he says, 'it has no close connection with the history of the diocese' (p. 146). But surely the diocese of Chichester was very much concerned in a 'career' which practically ended with that scene of humiliation in the December of 1457, when its chief pastor—the 'most paradoxical of divines,' as Mr. Freeman calls him—recanted his so-called 'heresies' at Paul's Cross, after the alternative, 'Abjure or be burned,' had been sternly presented by Archbishop Bourchier. Mr. Stephens describes the position which he had taken up as 'adverse to Lollardism, yet not heartily Papal, and occasionally almost verging upon rationalism.' But this does not give the reader a complete view of his tenets; for, as Mr. Stephens says in the *Memorials*, he sometimes upheld Papal supremacy 'to an extent which would now be called ultramontane' (see also Robertson, *Hist. Ch.* viii. 350; Perry, *Student's E. C. H.* i. 476). Somewhat more of information, we think, should have been given to readers of a Diocesan History on this singular phenomenon; a few sentences from the *Memorials* would have well supplied what was necessary; or Mr. Stephens might have quoted from Mr. Babington's introduction to Pecock's *Repressor* in the Master of the Rolls' Series.

In the troublous days of the next century it seems to have been the lot of several Bishops of Chichester to go with the ruling powers further than they really liked, and yet to find themselves in trouble. Sherborne accepted the royal supremacy, but 'to accept a system of doctrine and ceremonial manufactured under the direction of a man like Cromwell was more than he could bear'; so he resigned his see shortly before that convocation in which Cromwell sat as vicar-general

of 'the Supreme Head.' Sampson actually wrote in defence of the supremacy, but was sent to prison on false suspicion of Papalism. Day disliked the Prayer Book of 1549, and was probably slow to enforce the Act which established it; but when ordered to 'take down all altars,' he openly refused obedience, and was sent to the Tower.

It is curious that, in mentioning Barlow, Mr. Stephens omits the fact of his having consecrated Parker, and speaks of him without drawback as a 'consistent reformer.' This provokes us to quote a little from Mr. Dixon's *History of the Church of England*.

'In conduct somewhat rapacious, in his writings scurrilous, he was so enlightened in his views as to maintain that the true Church of God might consist of two elected cobblers in company; and that any layman, being learned, if he were chosen by the King, would be as good a bishop as himself or the best in England, without mention made of any orders' (i. 522);

words, by the way, which show that he *had* been duly consecrated; and in his answers to questions on the sacraments, &c., he went beyond others in saying that mere appointment, without ordination, could make a priest (*ib.* ii. 309). Consistent in subserviency, Barlow had got the see of Bath and Wells by a 'present or bribe of eighteen or nineteen manors' of the bishopric (*ib.* ii. 466). Mr. Stephens himself had referred to Hooper as reckoning Barlow among those who were 'devoted to reforming doctrines, even of the Helvetic type' (*Mem.* p. 250). We are not bound to admire the chief consecrator of Parker, although he was an instrument in the due transmission of the episcopate. He was succeeded by Curteys, a far better man. In the account of this prelate's activity 'lifestines' is, of course, a misprint for 'libertines' (see *Mem.* p. 257). Our author mentions (not without the natural resentment of a non-residentiary prebendary) the change made by Curteys's statutes (1574) in the constitution of the chapter, whereby the residentiaries were to be four only, and chosen by co-optation, and were each to reside three months. 'Thus the ancient cathedral body was reduced to a mere skeleton of its former self, and the original purposes of its creation were as nearly as possible frustrated. The connexion of the great mother church with the diocese through the medium of a large body of canons—resident sometimes on their prebends, sometimes within the precincts of the cathedral—was broken down; the maintenance by a large staff of clergy of frequent divine services, bearing some proportion in their variety to

the si
reduc
dence
incon
At th
be eff
much
best p
mothe
reside
requir
Their
reside
chapt
the cl
month
Mr. S
duce
servic
much
and th

Bi
himse
Host
calls t
accoun
was an
late of
Cushm
'leadi
which
deed i
mentio
analys
as hav
junctio
King
positio
made
we wis
with r
article
the evi
give P
the pe

the size of the building, came to an end. The services were reduced to two daily, the residentiary body to five, and residence was defined ' (*i.e.* for four out of the five) ' as being not inconsistent with nine months' absence out of twelve ' (p. 213). At the same time it must be observed that if a man was to be effectively 'resident on his prebend,' he could not have much time in the year for cathedral duties; and probably the best practical method of maintaining the connexion of the mother church with the diocese would be to assign to the residentiaries definite fields of general diocesan work, while requiring them to make the cathedral church their home. Their number might reasonably be increased, and their non-residentiary brethren should be summoned to take part in all chapter business not affecting the interior administration of the church, which is *not* their home. The scheme of three months' residence *plus* co-optation was bad indeed, and, as Mr. Stephens had said in his *Memorials*, was certain to produce both apathy and jobbery. As to greater 'variety in the services,' more, no doubt, might have been done, but hardly *much* more, in consideration at once of local circumstances and the excess of 'simplification' in the Prayer Book.

Bickley, the next bishop, is *said* to have distinguished himself, as a young Fellow of Magdalen, by outraging the Host in the college chapel. Mr. Stephens, in his *Memorials*, calls this story 'difficult to believe,' and gives a very eulogistic account of his diocesan administration, which began when he was an old man. In the *History* he is called 'a diligent prelate of the moderate type' of Parker. It was in his time that Cushman, of Buxted, a Roman recusant, was charged with 'leading his horse about the communion table in the chancel,' which shows that the table in that parish church stood indeed in the chancel, but not at the east end. Mr. Stephens mentions Bishop Harsnett as a strong anti-Calvinist (see an analysis of his Paul's Cross sermon in *Memorials*, p. 264), and as having had to rebuke the chapter for neglect of his injunction. Of Bishop Montagu's remarkable relations with King Charles and the Parliament, and of his ecclesiastical position in general, we are told nothing, but a reference is made to the *Memorials*, p. 269. Here, as in Pecoock's case, we wish that the readers of the *History* had been supplied with more direct information, besides the mention of his articles of inquiry as to the due order of Church service. In the evil days that followed, various 'influences concurred to give Puritan sentiment and Calvinistic doctrine a hold over the people in this diocese, which has not even yet been

wholly lost.' We referred in our last number to the probable necessity of 'obtaining' even such 'ornaments' as surplices after the restoration of the hierarchy and the Liturgy; and we observe that at Winchelsea, according to returns made to Bishop Lake's inquiries, there was neither linen cloth nor surplice in 1686 (p. 238). Sadly significant are the returns as to the number of communicants made to Bishop Waddington's inquiries in 1724, compared with those made to Bishop Watson's in 1603 (p. 242).

There is some painful and scandalous evidence of gross habits prevailing even among parochial clergy in the middle of the last century. Religious vitality was chiefly kept up among persons 'who belonged to the Puritan school.' When Wesley made attempts to move the South Saxons he was baffled 'partly by their smuggling, partly by their sluggishness, partly by an infusion of Calvinism which had been brought by the foreign Protestant refugees' (p. 258).

Mr. Stephens mentions with honour some well-known names of the present century which are in various ways connected with Church life in Sussex—such as those of Bishop Otter, Hugh Rose, H. M. Wagner, C. Marriott ('whose learning, ability, and goodness it would be superfluous to praise'), H. E. Manning, Julius Hare, J. Mason Neale—and dwells with something like enthusiasm on the munificence, energy, perseverance, and 'invincible faith' of Mr. Woodard, the founder of the schools at Lancing, Hurstpierpoint, Ardingly, and Bognor. To his own great father-in-law, Dean Hook, he makes but a casual reference: for him to say more, especially after his own biography of the dean, may well have seemed unnecessary.

We should add that great attention is paid in this volume to the subject of Church architecture, and that the reader will find (at p. 267) a vivid account, by Professor Willis, of the gradual ruin and final collapse of Chichester spire. Its restoration within six years, and the solemn reopening of the cathedral, are described at p. 270; and with the description should be associated the expression of fond and loyal admiration which (at p. 55) is transferred, in substance, from Mr. Stephens's earlier work.

'The beautiful and loveable church, as we now see it, in its delightful blending and contrast of severe massive Norman with the pure and graceful beginnings of Early English, is mainly what Bishop Seffrid' (the Second, acc. 1180) 'and his immediate successor, Simon of Wells' (acc. 1204) 'made it.'

recom
speci

I
Mr.
Engl
havo
rise i
their
to an
spot,
mony
It is
the m
great

T
clerg
Lich
the v
exter
of M
east
south
the c
page
on th
the s
in la
imme
creat
labor
We a
after
take
of B

M
tion
'mat
siona
which
the fa
the c
ing o

It cannot be needful for us, after these ample citations, to recommend Mr. Stephens's book to our readers as an excellent specimen of an English 'Diocesan History.'

III. Everyone who has visited Lichfield will agree with Mr. Freeman, that 'to modern eyes few episcopal sites in England are more attractive than that where, after all the havoc wrought by war and barbarism, the three spires still rise in all their grace and beauty above the silver pool at their feet.'¹ It is, indeed, a scene never to be forgotten; and to anyone who bears in mind the original consecration of the spot, its tender loveliness will be associated in exquisite harmony with all that is known of the gentle holiness of S. Chad. It is difficult in such moments to realize the significance of the name of 'the Field of Corpses,' as probably recording a great slaughter of Britons by Saxons.

The *History* now before us is the work of a parochial clergyman, who was trained in the Theological College at Lichfield, and is manifestly a most affectionate 'subject' of the venerable bishopric which, as he reminds us, originally extended its supervision throughout the whole kingdom of Mercia, 'from the Humber and Lincolnshire on the east to Gloucestershire and the Wye on the west, and southwards almost to London.' The mediæval extent of the diocese, as exhibited in the map prefixed to the title-page, had for its extreme points Birkenhead and Glossop on the north, and the Bridgenorth district and Edgehill on the south. And although this width of area was diminished in later ages, we are reminded of it when we think of the immense growth of population in the Black Country, which created requirements fatal, in the end, to the lives of such laborious prelates as Ryder and Butler, Bowstead and Selwyn. We are now glad to feel assured that, in a short time, and after many efforts, the creation of the see of Southwell will take off part of the burden that still weighs on the shoulders of Bishop Maclagan.

Mr. Beresford has taken much pains to gather information from various sources, although, as he complains, 'materials for the work are remarkably scanty.' Occasionally, however, we meet with really strange inaccuracies, which make one ask whether he has paid due attention to the father of English Church history. It is startling to find the conversion of Northumbria attributed to 'the preaching of men sent to it from Ireland (p. 14), as if there had been

¹ *Norm. Cong.* iv. 416.

no such thing as the missionary episcopate of S. Paulinus; nor do we understand how, after thus showing that he was thinking of S. Aidan, who may be said to have watered where his Roman predecessor had planted, Mr. Beresford should in the same breath, and repeatedly afterwards, speak of Finan, Aidan's successor, as a *British* bishop (pp. 14, 17), when Bede expressly informs us that Finan as well as Aidan was sent from the Scotie monastery of Hy or Icolmkill,¹ and therefore was no member of that Celtic Church which has been all but crushed by Saxon invasion. It is still more amazing in the very next page to find Cedd, Adda, Betti, and Diuma, called 'presbyters of the *old British Church*.' Bede expressly says that the first three were of 'Anglian race,' and therefore of the new English, not the old British, Church; and that the last was 'natione Scottus,'² i.e. an Irishman, as indeed Mr. Beresford rightly calls him a little further on, but spoils the admission by adding that 'he came back to the land of his fathers.' How could Britain be the fatherland of an Irishman? A similar mistake recurs as to Ceollach: he is called 'a Briton by descent' (p. 17), whereas he was, like Diuma, of Irish descent.³ All this is plainly written down in Bede. The blunder—for it is nothing less—has an obstinate trick of reappearance: thus, 'From Lindisfarne to London, from the Lincolnshire coast to Lichfield, the Gospel has been spread by missionaries of the *old British Church*' (p. 18). *Not* by Britons, we repeat, for they would not preach to Saxons, but by missionaries of Irish blood, tracing their traditions to the holy house of S. Columba. Again, why does Mr. Beresford call Oswy the son of the saintly Oswald (p. 14), when we know that he was Oswald's younger brother?⁴ Oswald's son was that unworthy Oidilwald who, having been made king in Deira under Oswy, betrayed his nation and his faith by joining with the heathen Penda⁵ in the final invasion of Northumbria, wherein at last Penda fell, and the pagan cause fell with him.

But there is worse to come. Speaking of the Paschal controversy, Mr. Beresford actually writes thus: 'The Britons always kept Easter on the same day of the month, March 14, without respect to the day of the week. The Roman Easter Day was always on a Sunday' (p. 18).

When we read this statement we could scarcely trust our eyes; but there it stands unmistakeably, and we must say,

¹ Bede, iii. 17, 25. See Ormsby, *Dioc. Hist. York*, p. 38.

² Bede, iii. 21, 24.

⁴ *Ibid.* iii. 14.

³ *Ibid.* iii. 21.

⁵ *Ibid.* iii. 24.

with
credit
Can
with
day,
ancie
be a
and
was
main
14th
where
the 2
was t
day.
the 2
not k
began
make
plain

'V
imagi
you k
Easte
regar
primā

B
canno
Turn
pictu
beaut
work
comin
bisho
built
also
writte
'the
from
broug
'If it

¹ I
Ornsb
² I

with whatever reluctance, that it is a statement highly discreditable to a 'Diocesan History' published by the S.P.C.K. Can it be that Mr. Beresford confuses the '14th of March' with the 14th of *Nisan*? Or need we repeat, at this time of day, that the British and Scotie usage was *not* that of the ancient Quartodecimans? That Easter Day must always be a Sunday, was a point indisputable alike for Celtic and Latin Churchmen; the real question between them was on which Sunday the festival ought to fall, and 'the main point of difference was that the Celts allowed the 14th of the moon to be Easter Day if it fell on a Sunday, whereas in that case they ought to have deferred Easter till the 21st. According to the orthodox reckoning, the 15th was the first day of the moon which could be Easter Sunday. This method, starting at the 15th and going on to the 21st, kept clear of the Jewish day, whereas the Celtic did not keep clear of it';¹ that is, the Celtic 'Paschal limits' began with the 14th, and ended with the 20th day. Bede makes Wilfrid, at the Whitby conference, state this quite plainly, and add—

'Whence it is clear that you, Colman, neither follow, as you imagine, the example of John, nor that of Peter, whose tradition you knowingly contradict. . . . For John, keeping the time of Easter in accordance with the decrees of the Mosaic law, paid no regard to the first day of the week; quod vos non facitis, qui non nisi primâ Sabbati Pascha celebratis,'² &c.

But why bring evidence for a point so certain? We cannot imagine how Mr. Beresford has thus missed it. Turning gladly to a pleasanter topic, we observe that he pictures the episcopal life of 'good S. Chad' according to the beautiful account of it which forms one of the gems of Bede's work; he describes the end of that life very felicitously, as coming on 'like a golden sunset,' and tells us that the holy bishop was buried 'outside' the 'small church which he had built at the eastern end of Stowe (or 'Chadstowe') pool. He also refers to Dean Bickersteth's 'admirable and lovingly written address on S. Chad and the Mercian Church' (rather, 'the Mercian Church and S. Chad'), and quotes a few sentences from it. We will quote another, on the charge of fanaticism brought by some against this great evangelizer of Mercia: 'If it is a fanatical thing to set God always before us, and

¹ Bright's *Chapters of Early English Church History*, p. 78. See Ornsby, p. 38.

² Bede, iii. 25.

to fear Him as well as to love Him, then certainly Chad was a fanatic, and it would be no great harm if there were a few more such fanatics among us.'

Chad's sanctity was doubtless made the most of when, 116 years after his death, his successor Higbert, under the combined authority of King Offa, of Pope Hadrian I., and the national Council of Chelsea, assumed the title of Archbishop, with metropolitical jurisdiction over six dioceses. The new archbishopric was shortlived, and the rights of Canterbury were restored by Leo III. and the 'worthless' Kenulf of Mercia in 802.

Mercia was rich in monasteries of royal foundation, Repton being its 'Westminster' (p. 41). On such highly favoured sanctuaries the rush of Danish fury broke in 874. Mr. Beresford describes the good effect of this 'purifying deluge.' The clergy, freed from the overshadowing power of the monasteries, acquired a more definite status; new minsters arose at Derby, Shrewsbury, and elsewhere; and 'the parochial system also grew.' But, ere long, Benedictine monasteries arose, of a more rigid type than the old ones at Repton or Hanbury. The greatest of these was S. Mary's at Coventry, which became a cathedral on this wise. In 1075 the see had been removed from the 'little village' of Lichfield to the old Roman city on the Dee, whose name still speaks of the 'Camp' of the Legions. But Robert de Lymesey, Bishop of Chester, was ill-pleased with his position, and mightily attracted by the riches of Coventry Minster, the very walls of which, in William of Malmesbury's glowing phrase, 'appeared too narrow to contain its treasures.' Accordingly, having scraped from one beam of its shrine an amount equal to 500 marks of silver, he provided himself, we are told, with wherewithal to obtain a Papal licence for the removal of his see to Coventry, and became abbot of the monastery as well as Bishop of the diocese. But Mr. Beresford makes a slip at p. 70, when he says that Bishop Durdent received from Rome the right to 'keep the abbey as a monastic cathedral like S. Augustine's at Canterbury'; he should have said, 'like Christ Church,' the metropolitical church itself, of which the Archbishop was held to be abbot. Mr. Beresford writes rather inconsistently about the monks. He speaks in one place (p. 55) of 'the *sullen* monks galloping out on Sundays to say the services in the churches' *appropriated* to their convents. Who told him that a monk's face, on such occasions, wore a scowl? And again he says that 'abbey prosperity . . . little blessed the hearts of the adjacent in-

habita
Henry
mothe
the '
monks
shows
in nee
much
dire.

Hi
used t
optim
was n
Churc
'The
her ol

No
effect
ing th
is sad
regar
to wh
scend
knew
did n
erecti
nothin

'with
Wester
agreed
first pl

Does
Churc
aries,
bisho
name
of Ro
Again
Churc
of im
Virgin
article

habitants' (p. 95); yet he also tells us that the poor, even in Henry's VIII.'s time, 'loved the abbeys as their nursing mothers' (p. 192); and in reference to Norman times he notes the 'strong contrast presented by the self-denial of the monks to the flagrant lust and sin of the age' (p. 56), and shows that 'the monastic system fortified religion when sorely in need of it' (p. 58). Of their civilizing activities he says much in various passages (e.g. pp. 66, 105), but *cela va sans dire*.

His view of the Anglo-Saxon theology is such as one used to find, with more or less distinctness, in the pages of optimizing Anglicans—that 'what the Saxon bishops taught was not "Romanism," but in substance the doctrine of the Church of England as we know it now' (p. 49), and so again, 'The Church of England comes out of her Reformation with her old Saxon doctrines' (p. 188).

No one can be more ready than ourselves to recognize the effect of the Tridentine Council in solidifying and accentuating the mediæval Latin beliefs. But Mr. Beresford's language is sadly in need of qualification. The early English Church regarded the Pope as her own special father and director,¹ to whom, according to the then received teaching, had descended the special Petrine prerogatives. Although she knew not of the later developments of Ultramontanism, she did not act independently of Rome in such matters as the erection and the abolition of a Mercian archbishopric; and nothing can be more uncritical than the statement that—

'with a laudable desire to become a part of the great unity of Western Christendom, the Church of England had in Saxon days agreed to acknowledge that the Bishop of Rome ought to have the first place among European bishops' (p. 97).

Does Mr. Beresford forget that the original nucleus of the Church of England was planted in Kent by Roman missionaries, and that its organic unity was secured by an archbishop especially commissioned from Rome? Or can he name a time in ante-Nicene Church history when the Bishop of Rome had *not* 'the first place among European bishops'? Again, to mention one or two other points, the Anglo-Saxon Church believed in purgatory, in the veneration of relics and of images, and in the invocation of saints, especially of the Virgin; and in regard to this latter point, we refer to a former article in this *Review*² containing ample evidence of the

¹ See, e.g., Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, &c. iii. 362, 447.

² *C. Q. R.* xiv. 277 ff.

'baselessness' of such a theory as Mr. Beresford has so complacently assumed. We may extract a concluding sentence.

'It is curious to think that a Church which tolerated the above prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary and other saints should . . . be described by recent Anglican historians as a model of primitive and orthodox simplicity.'

Even in Bede himself, as his affectionate readers well know, there are indications of an attitude of mind towards the saints which can neither be called primitive nor Anglican. Again, as to clerical marriages, Mr. Beresford practically informs his readers that the present freedom of the English clergy was equally enjoyed by their Saxon predecessors :

'The old English clergy had, up to this time' (about 1126), '*married* and lived in their parsonages much as their successors do now' (p. 57).

This would suggest to anyone that the Saxon 'mass-priest' was canonically free to marry after his ordination ; whereas even before the Nicene Council it was a rule that no priest should marry, although a married man might become a priest. Gregory the Great, in his *Answers* to Augustine, had permitted only clerks '*extra sacros ordines constituti*' to marry under certain circumstances.¹ Canon after canon implies the ecclesiastical unlawfulness of marriage on the part of a deacon or priest. Laxity on this head seems to have come in after the Danish invasion ; 'yet even then,' says Lingard, 'the marriage of priests was never approved by the Saxon prelates,'² and afterwards both royal and ecclesiastical authorities insisted not only that priests ought not to marry, but that they ought, if married men, to live in continence. Thus the Council of London, under King Edmund, declared that those who would not observe this rule deserved, after death, an unhallowed burial, though 'the severity of this law probably prevented its execution.'³ And the time to which Mr. Beresford refers is fifty years subsequent to that Council of Winchester under Lanfranc, which called upon the married canons to separate from their wives ; and, while excusing the parochial priests from this obligation, added succinctly, '*Non habentes interdicantur ut habeant*.'⁴ Mr. Beresford should have been more careful on

¹ Bede, i. 27.

² *Hist. Angl.-Sax. Ch.* i. 177.

³ Johnson, *E. E. Canons*, i. 366 ; Lingard, *l. c.*

⁴ See on this Freeman, *Norm. Cong.* iv. 423, and a note in Johnson, ii. 18 : 'An oath of chastity' (*i.e.* continence) 'was in this age imposed on all that entered into the superior orders . . . yet it is clear from this canon, and from can. 4, 1102' (*i.e.* Westminster, c. 7, that priests' sons

this su
avoid a

His
that si
'mona
actual
at Cov
Archbi
to res
mandy
settle
Lichfie
episcop
field is
1228
should
cathed
afterwa
VIII's
church
Franci
preach
say lit
a curio
said to
probab
Ardaco
indicat
of S. I
to a B
of Ass
at p. 1
'T
vicarag
should
of info
show,

be not
univers
Wescha
of the c
or those
in Ann
tells us
priests,
1 TH

this subject; it concerns the credit of Anglican writers to avoid a certain form of easy-going cant.

His picture of Bishop Hugh de Nunant sets before us that singular ex-prior who is said to have publicly declared 'monachos ad diabolum amandandos,' and who, for a time, actually succeeded in superseding the monks of his cathedral at Coventry by prebendaries, although, seven years later, Archbishop Hubert came to Coventry with Papal authority to restore the monks while Hugh was sojourning in Normandy.¹ Mr. Beresford does not give a clear account of the settlement of the question between the secular chapter of Lichfield and the monastic chapter of Coventry in the episcopate of Alexander de Stavenby. Thomas Chesterfield is explicit. Gregory IX., he says, ended the dispute in 1228 by deciding that episcopal elections to the bishopric should be performed by both chapters alternately in the two cathedrals. The style of the bishop was then, and for ages afterwards, Coventry and Lichfield—as Bishop Lee, in Henry VIII.'s time, told Cromwell that Coventry was his 'head church.' Stavenby is remarkable as the patron of the Franciscans, whom he employed in the diocese as itinerant preachers, and who 'revelled in their work' (p. 97). We can say little more of the mediæval portion of this *History*; but a curious slip or two may be noticed. Bishop Weseham is said to have had 'a suffragan, Brandon, Bishop of Ardacchen, probably *Armagh*' (p. 115). Not, surely, 'Bishop of Ardacchen.' *Ardacchensis* would be his signature, and would indicate *Ardagh*. The Primate of all Ireland, the successor of S. Patrick, was not likely to be acting as assistant prelate to a Bishop of Coventry. Again, at p. 138 we find a 'Bishop of Assavens; need we say, a Bishop of S. Asaph? Again, at p. 134 Pope 'Julius' XXII. is an obvious error for 'John.'

'To ordain vicarages,' at p. 141, must mean to provide vicarages for the parishes 'appropriated' by the monks. It should be added that Mr. Beresford had gleaned a great deal of information from the episcopal registers; and such records show, as in the case of Chichester, that long before the

be not heirs to their fathers' churches), 'that this oath had not been universally taken,' &c. While on this point, we may observe that Bishop Weseham, in the thirteenth century, did not inquire simply whether any of the clergy were married (p. 115), but whether any beneficed persons, or those who ranked below sacred orders, were married (Burton Chron. in *Annal. Monastici*, i. 297, Rolls Series); and Mr. Beresford himself tells us that it was a common abuse for mere youths, who could not be priests, to hold benefices (p. 129).

¹ Thomas Chesterfield's *History*, in Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, i. 436.

Reformation the monastic communities had too often left their first love; witness the grave disorders which Bishop Norbury detected at Tutbury, and the coarse irregularities which Bishop Bolars censured at Burton. We are told that mere lads were put into livings while they were still students; that the number of ordinands at Ember-tides was very large; that excommunications were sometimes showered broadcast; that 'the gorgeousness of the old worship was largely owing to the generosity of the worshippers'; that architecture was much furthered by indulgences; that the clergy in the terrible days of the Black Death 'stood to their posts and died with their people'; that Lollardy in the fifteenth century 'appeared as a wild and fanatical heresy.'

When in the next century the great change came, Rowland Lee was the newly-made bishop—one whose chief work was secular, as he held the presidency of Wales, and, as Whitlocke says, 'marchiam latrociniis purgavit.'¹ He was an obsequious servant of Henry VIII., and 'is said' to have performed the marriage with Anne Boleyn;² but his 'earnest effort in the beginning of 1538' to save Coventry Cathedral by getting it converted into 'a college church, as Lichfield'—i.e. a minster of secular canons—was all in vain. This monastic cathedral, which represented the original minster of Earl Leofric, and which far surpassed its Lichfield rival in size and stateliness, being itself the chief glory of a city signally rich in noble churches, was given up to those whose motto was, 'Let us make havoc of them altogether.' Dugdale says that it was 'pulled in pieces and reduced to rubbish.'³ Recent investigations, as Mr. Beresford tells us, have brought to light from beneath masses of débris 'the whole of the inner portion of the west front, with part of the exterior, in an excellent state of preservation' (p. 194). Mr. Beresford is sufficiently severe on the proceedings of Henry's 'visitors,' and he adds a significant remark;

'After the loss of its minster the population of the ancient and beautiful city of Coventry declined by half in a single generation' (p. 209).

What is more momentous, he points out that something like a real relapse into 'heathenish superstition was the result 'in

Wharton, i. 456.

² Froude, *Hist. Engl.* i. 392.

³ Dugdale's *Monasticon*, iii. 187. Of course the great relic, an arm of S. Augustine of Hippo, bought by Archbishop Ethelnoth at Pavia for a large sum, was cast away. Of course, also, its silver case became an ornament of some private 'cupboard.'

the mo
East C
Abbeys
scattered
Prestbur
has 'giv
which I
minsters
cannot s

We
however
out of th
for the
spoiler'
Layton
Coventr
part of

The
too ind
Mr. Ber
from ab
and the
felt the
youths

Now
the fact
power?
constitu
Beresfo

'Tha
iniquito
a specul
but not
This is a
score un
in any fa
thing pr

They
English
Roman
crime a
priests,
they we

¹ Ha
the same

the moorlands of Staffordshire and the broad forest slopes of East Cheshire, after the wreck of Combermere and Chester Abbeys drained away almost all the endowments of the scattered chapels in the wide parishes of Alstonfield and Prestbury into lay hands.' A writer on 'Derbyshire Churches' has 'given the names of ninety-five chapels in Derbyshire which have disappeared since King Henry robbed the minsters. And so it was everywhere: *for country churches cannot survive the loss of endowment.*'

We call attention to these impressive words. Justice, however, is done by Mr. Beresford to that upgrowth of schools out of the spoils of minsters which was a sort of compensation for the losses inflicted on the Church. Even 'the great spoiler' himself, who got his work done by such agents as Layton and London, had founded a school on 'the ruins of Coventry Cathedral' (p. 223), and had carried out a small part of his own scheme for the creation of new bishoprics.

The account of Elizabeth's anti-Papal legislation is far too indulgent. Not to go back beyond the bull of Pius V., Mr. Beresford speaks of the seminary priests who came over from abroad and 'died like Britons'—rather, like Christians—and then remarks, in his easy-going optimism, 'the English felt the justice of Elizabeth's severity, but were sorry for the youths who perished' (p. 227).

Now, was it properly 'justice' to presume treason from the fact that a person refused to deny the Pope's deposing power? We recommend the following words of a great constitutional historian and an eminently just writer to Mr. Beresford's attention:—

'That which renders these condemnations of Popish priests so iniquitous is that the belief in, or rather the refusal to disclaim, a speculative tenet, dangerous indeed and incompatible with loyalty, but not coupled with any overt act, was construed into treason. . . . This is applicable to the great majority of capital convictions on this score under Elizabeth. The persons convicted could not be traitors in any fair sense of the word, because they were not charged with anything properly denominated treason.'¹

They were convicted of saying Mass, or of reconciling Englishmen to the Roman Church—in short, of acting as Roman priests. And, in default of evidence of any actual crime against the State, it was presumed that, being Roman priests, who, as such, declined to deny a popular Roman tenet, they were meditating some such crime. To call this 'justice,'

¹ Hallam's *Const. Hist. Engl.* i. 161. See his summary at the end of the same chapter.

instead of gross persecution produced by wrathful terror, is simply to misuse one's moral sense. We heartily agree with Lord Macaulay on this subject:—

'To punish a man because he has committed a crime, or because he is believed, though unjustly, to have committed a crime, is not persecution. To punish a man because we infer from the nature of some doctrines which he holds, or from the conduct of other persons who hold the same doctrines with him, that he will commit a crime, is persecution, and is, in every case, *foolish and wicked*.'¹

Nor, when we speak of the bull of 1570, ought it to be forgotten that persecution on the part of Elizabeth's government had begun in the outset of her reign; that, as Hallam says, it thus 'gave rise to those reunions of disaffected exiles which never ceased to endanger the throne of Elizabeth;' and that the fact that the mere refusal to attend Anglican worship, and thereby deny religious convictions, was made a punishable offence, must be recognized as one provocative cause of the desperate step at last taken by Pius V. And when our author says that 'Churchmen left harsh measures to the civil power,' we again remind him that Hallam has said, 'Too many of the Anglican clergy, whether Puritan or not, thought no measure of charity or compassion should be extended to them' (Papists). Grindal hinted to the Council in 1562 that an arrested priest might be tortured. The story that Bishop Aylmer 'sent a young Catholic lady to be whipped in Bridewell for refusing to conform . . . is hardly rendered improbable by Aylmer's harsh character.'²

Anglican writers do but serve the Roman cause by extenuating the oppressive or cruel measures which were taken in those fierce times by professed upholders of the religion and Church of England. We can well afford to recognize facts, and to condemn wrongdoing; and we regret that a writer who is adopted by the S. P. C. K. should here have failed in both these duties.³

Entering the seventeenth century, Mr. Beresford bestows a just eulogy on Bishop Overall, quoting Archbishop Williams's commendation of his three excellences as controversialist—selection of a few apposite texts, pertinent citation of the Fathers, and tolerance of differences when the 'foundation' had been made sure.

But we hope it will not seem captious if we say that the

¹ Macaulay's *Essays*, ed. 1850, p. 54.

² Hallam, 137, 140.

³ See an article in *C. Q. R.*, vol. viii. p. 98 ff., on 'The Elizabethan Martyrs.'

combin
become
the Ch
Catech
the sec
of the
quiet y
Fellow
to hav
secured
of him
Overall
Ecclesl
remark
absence
and da
in Lich
tells us
Body o
and rea
his cele
tion 'in
ment, t
of the C
commu
which
say tha
English
control

Bish
reports
lecture,
corners
gravely
a true
uncerta
been la
'poor v
willing
singula
'had s
with d
wards.
good c
the Clo

combination of the two adjectives 'grand' and 'old' has become of late a little wearisome; Mr. Beresford applies it to the Church of England herself in p. 19, and in p. 231 to the Catechism, which, as everyone knows, Overall completed by the section on the Sacraments. One is glad to be reminded of the presence of 'young John Cosin' at Eccleshall, in those quiet years, as Overall's secretary and librarian. The youthful Fellow of Caius College, then about twenty years old, is said to have 'endeared himself day by day to his patron, and secured and merited his fullest confidence.' We may think of him as sitting beside his 'lord and master'—so he calls Overall in his *Notes on the Prayer Book*—in the library at Eccleshall, treasuring up all his observations, including the remarkable statement that it were 'better to endure the absence of the people than for the minister to neglect the usual and daily' (Eucharistic) 'sacrifice of the Church'; or listening in Lichfield Cathedral to the Bishop preaching, in which, he tells us, he had heard him 'a hundred times' affirm that 'the Body of Christ was received by us sacramentally, spiritually, and really, but not corporally'; or observing how Overall, in his celebrations, took the freedom to use the prayer of oblation 'in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament, to make an offering of it, as being the true public sacrifice of the Church, unto God . . . and when that was done, he did communicate the people,' &c. Considering the influence which Cosin exercised over the Revision of 1661, we may say that his sojourn at Eccleshall was fruitful of good to the English Church, and that Overall was thus unconsciously controlling her later career.

Bishop Wright, in 1633, suppressed—as Laud's annual reports of his province tell us—what was called 'the running lecture,' intended by the Puritans 'to illuminate the dark corners of the diocese'; on which King Charles comments gravely, 'If there be dark corners in this diocese, it were fit a true light should illuminate it, and not this that is false and uncertain.' But in 1637 Wright is not so satisfactory; he had been lately complained of to the King for making waste of the 'poor woods there remaining'; and Laud found him not over willing to 'give an account of that particular,' nor of the singular outrage committed by a lady, apparently mad, who 'had sprinkled the altar-hangings and the bishop's throne with dirty water.' However, things mend somewhat afterwards. Laud hopes, in 1639, that 'that diocese is in reasonable good order'; but Wright has no comfort in residing within the Close, because his predecessors had leased out part of his

house there. In the next year he told the Primate that he had an ancient palace at Coventry, on lease, but with reservation of his right to occupy it. 'Here he means to reside for a time, if it stand with your Majesty's liking.' The marginal note is, 'C.R. I am content.' 'Regardless of the sweeping whirlwind's sway!'

That storm soon burst; but, after all allowance made on the score of Charles I.'s association of ecclesiastical interests with government by prerogative, we cannot understand why Mr. Beresford charges him with having 'betrayed the Church.' It is, in one word, a wrongful accusation. If Charles would have 'betrayed the Church' in order to make terms with Parliamentary Puritanism, he might have saved his crown and his life. And Mr. Beresford, in the context, loses a rich opportunity. There is one point in the history of Lichfield which rises in interest to the high level of romance: we need not say that we mean the double siege of the Close in 1643, which long ago formed the basis of a story (written, indeed, from the standpoint of indiscriminating royalism) by one whose title of 'Prebendary of Lichfield,' prefixed to some once popular books, associated the early days of the Church movement with the name of 'the fair cathedral.' Mr. Beresford has some notion of the picturesque element in history; but nothing can be poorer and more disappointing than the few lines which he bestows on the subject of Mr. Gresley's little volume; and we should have thought it impossible for an educated Englishman to speak of the siege without quoting from the sixth canto of *Marmion*. True, he had in an earlier chapter described the Close in a passage of some vividness (p. 190), although, by a slip which we should not have expected, 'prebend' is there substituted for 'prebendary.' But why did he not at least quote Clarendon?

'The very day he (Lord Brook) meant to assault it, sitting in his chamber, and the window open, he was, from the wall of the Close' (tradition, followed by Mr. Gresley and Mr. Beresford, says, from the central steeple), 'by a common soldier' (rather, a brother of Sir Richard Dyott, born deaf and dumb) 'shot with a musket in the eye, of which he instantly died without speaking a word' (March 2, S. Chad's Day, 1643). 'It was reported that in his prayer that very morning . . . he wished that if the cause he were in were not right and just, he might be presently cut off. . . . The same forces, under Sir John Gell, proceeded so vigorously in the work, and they within' (the Close) 'so faintly and unskilfully, that . . . the place was yielded without other conditions than those of quarter.'

¹ See the account of Bishop Clinton's establishment of 'prebendaries,' to each of whose stalls 'a small estate or *prebend* was attached' (p. 64).

In
'Prim
storm
yields
had
gover
son,
incom
which
chase
found
crated
house
choir
burne
tism o
simila
sixty-
bishops
of the
expres
'barga
soliciti
Mr. B
tion o
was re
Bishop
tality,
action
week o
hearing
dral, h
chamb
God an
We can
self-dev
in the c
One
century
Method
and wo
making

¹ See
² Bro
members
VOL.

In the following month, however, as Mr. Beresford says, 'Prince Rupert, after a ten days' siege, drained the moat, and stormed the northern walls with great loss: the place yielded,' &c. Not a word about the difficulties which Rupert had to confront, the 'resolution' of the Parliamentary governor Rouswell, the fanaticism of his well-provided garrison, the obstinacy of their defence (in sad contrast to the incompetency of their Royalist predecessors), the satisfaction which 'his Highness' had in 'his conquest, though the purchase had shrewdly shaken his troops,'¹ and though he found the cathedral miserably defaced and barbarously desecrated. The central spire had fallen in ruins over the chapter-house before the first siege was over; and afterwards the choir had been wrecked, the tombs ransacked, the records burned, and, it is said, the font profaned by the mock baptism of a calf. Mr. Beresford briefly refers to these and similar outrages. After the Restoration, John Hacket, at sixty-eight, but with 'age like a lusty winter,' accepted the bishopric, and instantly set to work to 'repair the breaches of the house,' bestowing on this task, as Browne Willis expresses it, 'incredible prudence and fidelity,' ability in 'bargaining with workmen, and unspeakable diligence in soliciting for money.'² One of the most vivid passages in Mr. Beresford's volume is the description of the restoration of the cathedral, the glad Christmas Eve on which it was re-dedicated, and the active, useful life of the brave old Bishop in the Close—his weekly preachings, his kindly hospitality, his abhorrence of the laxity that the anti-Puritan reaction had encouraged, and the pathetic incident in the last week of his life, when, after going into the next room and hearing the first sound of a new-hung tenor bell in the cathedral, he called it his 'passing bell' and returned to his bed-chamber to die. But he had so lived that the maxim, 'Serve God and be joyful,' was appropriately engraven on his tomb. We can imagine what he felt when he heard of the heroic self-devotion of one of his own clergy, Mompesson of Eyam, in the days of the Great Plague.

One point only in Mr. Beresford's survey of the eighteenth-century life of the diocese shall here be mentioned. The Methodist movement, largely provoked by clerical negligence and worldliness, was called 'Popish' because it insisted on making religion a power, and encountered a special brutality

¹ See Clarendon, vol. ii. 203, 314.

² Browne Willis, *Cathedrals*, &c., p. 378. Hacket, it should be remembered, was a partizan of Williams, and writes severely of Laud.

of resistance on the part of Staffordshire mobs. *Passi graviora!*

Mr. Beresford's style is usually lively and 'readable,' but the liveliness is occasionally a little off-hand. He can sketch a scene with some vigour: witness the concourse of various parishes to the cathedral on Midlent Sunday:

'The pilgrim bands came into the Close over the port and entered the minster by the south door. Turning to the right, down the south-choir aisle, they got, perhaps, a short exhibition of the head of S. Chad as they passed along the little stone gallery over the prebendaries' door. Then they would go onwards to the great shrine, where their yearly offerings were made' (p. 121).

Or we get a combination of playfulness and deep earnestness, as in the account of 'anchorites.'

'Neighbouring householders sent them food, which was passed in to them through a curtained hole in the wall. At these openings many a humbled conscience asked their prayers and advice; and sometimes, in the case of an anchoress, not a little gossiping was done. When not so employed, or at prayer, or listening to the service within the adjoining church, the anchorite was supposed to be musing on religious subjects, especially the Passion of our Blessed Lord; and forth from such a cell, burning with the living fire of a soul which knew both itself and God, came one of the great diocesan preachers of the Middle Ages, John Grace . . . who, in 1423, having obtained licence from Bishop Heyworth, preached five successive days at Coventry, and three among the canons in Lichfield Close' (see pp. 162, 154).

There is also a good description of the old Norman cathedral of Lichfield, with its broad apsidal chancel and its throne behind the altar (p. 88); and the abominable treatment of the existing church by Wyatt in 1789 is well characterized as a 'crippling' process, a 'sad transformation,' which fitly symbolized the close of a century of drooping Church life' (p. 270).

The book has a fair index, but has not what it should have, a catalogue of the bishops. It is written from the point of view of moderate but loyal Churchmanship. We do not know whether any emphasis is to be laid on the proposition in the sentence, 'The altars are built and devoted ministers stand *beside* them' (p. 296). One passage, in which the phrase 'Establishment' occurs, is somewhat perplexing, Mr. Beresford says that in the twelfth century the Church was national but not established—that is, its relations to the State had not yet become clearly defined. Hence there was continual strife. . . . The growth of establishment was

the es
was e
man h
point,
is a p
that t
or rat
which
stood
ligious
after
monar
repres
in a r
how fa
has hi
But w
closing
nize g
Lichfi
flaws a
three
highes
torian

1. *Petr*
of
M
2. *The*
18
3. *San*
S

WHEN
fallen a
West,
puted

¹ Fre
admirab
² Ch

the establishment of peace' (p. 69). Now, the Church never was established by any definite act of the State. Mr. Freeman has shown that the events of 1662 come nearest to this point, but do not come up to it; that 'by law established' is a phrase which once had an exclusive sense, indicating that the Church was one of the institutions of the country, or rather that it represented the national religious life, but which, after the Revolution, came to mean that the Church stood in a special relation to the State in which other religious bodies did not stand.¹ And as things now are—after the gradual transfer of the governing powers from a monarch professedly in sympathy with the Church to the representative of a House of Commons which is omnigenous in a religious sense—we leave it to our readers to consider how far any 'definition of the Church's relations to the State' has hitherto established peace, in the true sense of the term. But we must not enter now on such considerations. In closing this survey of 'Three Diocesan Histories,' we recognize good work done by the writers on Peterborough and Lichfield; but we regret to find in Mr. Beresford's book such flaws as we have been obliged to indicate, and taking the three volumes together, we must unhesitatingly assign the highest place, in a scholarly sense, to the accomplished historian of Chichester.

ART. VI.—THE GREGORIAN PAPACY.

1. *Petri Privilegium*. Three Pastoral Letters to the Clergy of the Diocese of Westminster. By HENRY EDWARD MANNING, D.D. (London, 1871.)
2. *The See of S. Peter*. By T. W. ALLIES, M.A. (London, 1850.)
3. *Sancti Gregorii Papæ I. Opera Omnia, Studio Monachorum Sancti Benedicti*. (Paris, 1705.)

WHEN we last surveyed the history of the Papacy,² it had fallen away from much of its authority and influence in the West, owing to the crimes of the intruded simoniac and reputed murderer, Pope Vigilius, and the extreme unpopularity

¹ Freeman, *Disestablishment and Disendowment*, p. 47 ff. This admirably luminous little book ought to be well known to our readers.

² *Church Quarterly Review*, October 1882, p. 109.

of his also intruded successor, Pelagius I. Never—not even in the sharpest crisis of the Great Schism, or in the Reformation era itself—did the fabric so toilsomely and patiently built up by Innocent I. and his great successor Leo I. seem so near moral and political extinction. Pelagius, refused allegiance even in the city of Rome itself, found his authority denied and his orthodoxy impugned in all Northern Italy and Tuscany, in Illyricum, in Africa, Gaul, Spain, and, substantially, the entire West. His one hope of maintaining his position lay in an appeal to that civil power by which he had been uncanonically thrust into the Papal chair. He called on Narses, then Viceroy of Italy for the Emperor, to arrest the Bishops of Venetia, Istria, and Liguria as rebels against Papal authority, and to send them for trial to Constantinople, on the ground that it was the duty of the State to repress by the secular arm all schismatic disturbers of the peace of the Church. Narses, however, refused to interfere; and the threatened prelates formally renounced the communion of Rome, in which they were joined by Honoratus of Milan, and by all the bishops of Tuscany. They went still further, and erected themselves into a new Patriarchate, under the Archbishop of Aquileia: and it is a very curious fact in ecclesiastical history that the rank thus irregularly conferred on that see has never been abrogated, though the seat of the titular Patriarchate has been twice transferred, owing to the decay of Aquileia, first to Grado and then to Venice, whose archbishop still is officially entitled Patriarch. And it is not inapposite to point out that the Aquileian revolt thus contributed in the long run, after the schism had been healed a century and a half later, to the aggrandisement of the Papal authority, by making it appear something above and beyond the Patriarchal dignity, as having Patriarchs themselves within the area of its jurisdiction, and subject to its control as completely as any mere suffragan prelate might be.¹

Pelagius did not tamely accept the revolt, weak as his position was morally. It is to be remembered that the main charge against him was, not the irregularity of his entrance on the Papacy (though that had weight in Rome and Tus-

¹ This was made more easy by the curious fact that, after the Patriarchate of Aquileia was translated to Grado, the Aquileians, unwilling to lose the prestige of the title, continued to style their bishop as before; and there were for centuries two patriarchs side by side in the same region: one at Grado, within the limits of the Roman Empire, and the other at Aquileia, within those of the Lombard kingdom, but both owing the Papal authority.

cany)
thoug
recen
adopt
bisho
laid o
draw
of th
in We
had s
It is
group
had o
thoug
previ
and t
Gener

Be
the P
a lett
allegi
memo
thoug
in the
North
credit
infrin
his co
manif
less a
dissat
large,
his or
him a
mitted
ment
influe
as to
munio
schism
favour
with t
the w

cany), but a doubt of his loyalty to the decrees of Chalcedon, thought in the West to be impugned by those of the then recent Fifth General Council. Accordingly the line he adopted, in a far from undignified letter to the Tuscan bishops, was to declare that they had violated the principle laid down by S. Augustine—that the test of schism is withdrawal from the jurisdiction and communion of the bishops of the apostolic sees; and Rome being the only such see in Western Christendom, it followed that the revolting bishops had separated themselves from the whole Catholic Church. It is noticeable that the Pope merely includes Rome in a group of sees of the same class, as Irenæus and Tertullian had done, and does not describe it as *the* Apostolic See, though such had been the Roman usage for a very long time previous. He then proceeds to vindicate his own orthodoxy and that of his predecessors, as adhering loyally to the four General Councils.¹

But the further West had still to be reckoned with, and the Pope felt himself obliged to make a wider apology, in a letter he addressed to the whole body of the faithful, again alleging his orthodoxy, and declaring his reverence for the memories of Theodoret and Ibas, whose orthodoxy was thought to be impeached by the action of the Fifth Council in the matter of the 'Three Chapters.' But the Tuscan and North Italian bishops did not believe his protestations, nor credit the assertion that the Fifth Council had in no respect infringed upon the Fourth, so that they continued aloof from his communion; and a more singular proof of distrust was manifested from Gaul, for Childebert I., King of Paris, doubtless acting on the suggestion of the Gallic prelates, professed dissatisfaction with the Pope's allocution to the Church at large, and sent an ambassador to Rome to inform him that his orthodoxy was not regarded as clear, and to demand from him a more explicit confession of his faith. Pelagius submitted to the demand, again alleging his unalterable attachment to the decrees of Chalcedon; but although the political influence of Narses was exercised in the Pope's favour so far as to induce some of the Italian bishops to return to his communion, yet at his death in 560 not only was the Aquileian schism an accomplished fact, but the Papal judgment in favour of the Fifth Council, so far as it was thought to clash with that of Chalcedon, was unanimously rejected by virtually the whole West; and the most irresistible proof is thus

¹ Pelagii *Epist.* v. (*al.* vi.)

afforded that, in the middle of the sixth century, the tenet of the Pope's being at once the centre of Catholic unity and the supreme judge of Christian doctrine had no more succeeded in establishing itself even in Italy than in Constantinople itself. The settled conviction of the great body of the Western episcopate was that the Fifth Council was no true œcumenical synod, but a servile assembly under Imperial coercion, and neither free nor unquestionably orthodox; while the recognition accorded to it by Popes Vigilius and Pelagius, instead of establishing its validity and making it binding on Christendom, did but compromise their own character for orthodoxy, as bringing them into conflict with the admittedly binding Council of Chalcedon. This fact disposes at once of the whole allegation that it is the consent of the Pope which validates the acts of a Council, and that he can dispense with, or so much as modify, the decrees of any œcumenical synod. It is noticeable that this was no mere passing theory, for one of the exceptions alleged by the Gallican bishops two centuries later against the Second Council of Nice, which established the cultus of images, was that it had no claim to rank as œcumenical, because the Western Church was represented only by two Papal legates, whose assent, though ratified by the Pope, could not bind the West.

No events bearing on the question of Papal authority marked the pontificates of John III. and Benedict I., save that the rapid loss of most of Justinian's Western conquests after that emperor's death seriously weakened the Imperial power even in Rome and Southern Italy, though still part of the Empire, and paved the way for the recovery of independence by the clergy, who had been bowed under an Erastian yoke of no little weight and stringency during that whole long reign of nearly thirty-nine years which ended in 565.

Accordingly, when Benedict I. died in 577, the Roman clergy took courage to elect and consecrate Pelagius II. without applying for or awaiting the imperial *congé d'élire*, and the new Pope thus entered on his office without any sense of obligation or duty towards the Byzantine Court, such as had inevitably shaped the policy of several of his predecessors. Only two circumstances in his pontificate, however, need to be cited: his attempt to end the Istrian schism, and his beginning the dispute with John the Faster for assuming the title of 'œcumenical Patriarch.' What makes the negotiations of Pelagius with the Istrian bishops, in themselves ineffectual, interesting in the present inquiry, is that in their course a fresh claim on behalf of the Papal See is tentatively put forward for

the
mod
Bish
the
S. M
the
S. P
tram
that
he c
of S
bish
the
of C
to r
tatio
the
pass
teac
the
rate
the
erra
in d
his
reed

epis
not
rele
tem
Vig
bish
Gre
the
bett
stro
igno
all t
resis
Chu
com
conv
the

the first time—that of inerrancy in the faith ; the germ of the modern tenet of Papal Infallibility. His first letter to the Bishops of Istria, thought to be in truth drafted by Gregory the Great himself, then often acting as Papal secretary, takes S. Luke xxii. 31, 32, as its text, and argues at length that the privilege of indefectibility in the faith was bestowed on S. Peter in virtue of Christ's prayer for him, and passed by transmission to the Popes of Rome as S. Peter's heirs, and that they had in point of fact been accordingly orthodox, as he claimed to be himself, since adhering loyally to the Tome of S. Leo and to the Council of Chalcedon. To this the Istrian bishops replied that the Pope, in signing the condemnation of the Three Chapters, had in fact denied the faith of the Council of Chalcedon, which they were determined to uphold, and not to return to his communion till he had reaffirmed it by retraction of his opposition to the Three Chapters. They disputed the interpretation he had put on the texts he cited, and adduced passages from the writings of the Fathers in proof that his teaching was not in accord therewith. A second letter from the Pope in rejoinder to this defiance brought only an elaborate vindication of the orthodoxy of the Three Chapters, with the further comment—traversing the whole plea of Papal inerrancy—that Pope Vigilius had been as forward as any one in defending the Three Chapters ; and though he had changed his views, that was no reason why they too should be like a reed shaken by the wind, and weakly change theirs.

To this home-thrust the Pope made answer in the long epistle which is known as his Tome, undoubtedly inspired, if not wholly composed, by Gregory. That part of it which is relevant to the present inquiry is the manner in which he attempts to meet the objection based on the tergiversations of Vigilius. He says that Vigilius himself and the other Latin bishops who took part with him at first, were ignorant of Greek, and consequently fell into error as to the meaning of the documents in dispute, but corrected themselves when better informed ; so following the pattern of S. Paul, who strove manfully for the faith which he had once resisted in ignorance. And then he adds : ' Remember, brethren, besides all this, the action of Peter, who is Paul's superior. He long resisted the admission of the Gentiles to the faith by Holy Church without circumcision, and withdrew himself from the communion of the converted Gentiles.' But when S. Paul convinced him that he was to blame :—

' He says : " Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear ? "

Ought they, dearest brethren, to have answered Peter, Prince of the Apostles, when thus teaching in these words in contradiction to himself, in your fashion, "We cannot listen to what you say, because you formerly preached otherwise"? So then in the matter of the Three Chapters, one thing was said while search for the truth was being made, and another thing when the truth was found. Why should a change of opinion be alleged as a crime against this See, when the whole Church humbly reveres the same thing in its founder? For it is not change of opinion, but unsteadfastness of understanding, which is blameworthy. When, therefore, the intention is unshaken to learn what is right, what objection is there to its changing its language when rejecting its ignorance?"¹

This remarkable apology, if not a complete withdrawal of the claim of permanent inerrancy, advanced in the former letter, is at the least an assertion of no more than *final* infallibility in the judgments of the Roman Chair, virtually admitting that its intermediate rulings may be seriously erroneous, and in need of correction, and is thus a confession of the fallibility of the Roman See.² For the conceivable plea in reply, that temporary error as to matters of fact and document does not affect the principle of infallibility, obviously breaks down when, as in the case of Vigilius, a ruling vitiated by such error is actually promulgated for the instruction of the faithful by the erring Pope. Clearly, all who accept such a ruling, and die before it has been corrected, have been led astray irrecoverably, so far as this world is concerned, and the ultimate infallibility has been useless to them as a guide.

As to the assumption of the style 'Universal Patriarch' by John the Faster, the fact is that this very title had been attributed to his predecessor Epiphanius, so far back as 533, by a rescript of Justinian, and similarly by the same Emperor to Anthemius and Mennas;³ so there is some reason to think that it may have been customarily used thenceforward, and not have been an innovation of the Patriarch John. In 587 Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, was impeached before the Emperor Maurice, who granted him a canonical trial before a synod composed of the Eastern Patriarchs and several metropolitans, with some senators, which resulted in his acquittal, and John, in signing the final decree, described himself as 'Œcumenical Patriarch.' The nuncio appears to have sent notice of this to the Pope, who immediately alleged that all

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 586, lvi.

² Maimbourg, *Traité Hist. des Prérogat. de l'Eglise de Rome*, c. vii.

³ Justin. *Novell.* 7, 16, 42.

the pr
fessed
This h
taken
ions :
rebelli
Himse
2. Tha
to con
especi
longed
no syn
Pope,
had in
annull
questi
ments
decess
any in
themse
upon i
was th
becaus
their o
error,
munio
is not
use by
rights
since t
is not
just cl
Al
decisi
had re
in set
' petty
wisdon
reason
munica
renoun
belief
later fa

the proceedings were thereby vitiated, and accordingly professed to annul the decision of the synod on that ground. This he did in a letter addressed to all the bishops who had taken part in the synod, wherein he makes the following assertions: 1. That the whole action of John was that of bold rebellion not only against the Apostolic See, but against Christ Himself, as clashing with His words: 'Thou art Peter,' &c. 2. That in styling himself Universal Bishop, and in venturing to convene a general council, he had encroached upon the especial privilege of the See of S. Peter, to which alone it belonged to convoke such assemblies, and without whose approval no synod had ever been accounted ratified. 3. That he, the Pope, in virtue of that power of binding and loosing which he had inherited from S. Peter, on whom Christ had conferred it, annulled and quashed all the proceedings of the synod in question. 4. That in the Roman archives were laid up documents under the hand and seal of John himself and his predecessors, solemnly declaring that they had never acted with any insubordination towards the See of Rome, and binding themselves by anathema never to do so, and never to encroach upon its rights or on those of any other See. 5. That there was thus no need to anathematize or excommunicate them, because they had already anathematized themselves under their own signatures; but that John, if failing to amend his error, should be excommunicated, and cut off from the communion of all holy bishops. 6. That the title of 'Universal' is not to be used or recognized, being a profane word, whose use by any Patriarch, even the highest, derogates from the rights of other Patriarchs, and so is to be avoided in all letters, since the writers, when bestowing on another an honour which is not his due, are in fact stripping themselves of their own just claims.¹

Although Pelagius thus assumed the right to quash a decision which was that of the whole Eastern Church, and had received imperial confirmation, describing the synod itself in set terms of studied contempt as a 'conventicle' and a 'petty gathering' (*conciliabulum*), yet he had the practical wisdom to accept its acquittal of Gregory of Antioch, the one reason for which it met, while directing his nuncio to excommunicate the Patriarch of Constantinople until he should renounce the title of Universal. Launoï has expressed disbelief in the authenticity of this letter, judging it to be a later fabrication, modelled on the lines of, and substituted for,

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 587, § viii.-xii.

the genuine but lost document. This he decides mainly on account of its assertion of the Papal right to convoke and ratify Councils as an acknowledged fact, seeing that the untruth of that claim was too notorious and familiar in that age to be safely ventured on, especially at Constantinople, as it would have been in fact impeaching all the Popes who had submitted to Imperial summoning to Councils;¹ whereas when Hadrian I. advanced it just two centuries later (785), there was probably no one in Western Christendom competent to detect its untenability. And as regards the real point at issue between Rome and Constantinople, it is to be noticed that the latter see did not in point of fact attempt to wield any despotic authority over the remaining Eastern Churches, far less to infringe the rights of any Western see, but simply desired to hold what had been canonically conferred upon it by two General Councils, and to continue the exercise of its lawful jurisdiction, threatened as it was by the persistent Roman claim to dominate all Christendom, and to set aside all local rights which impeded such action. For Constantinople to have yielded the point in dispute would therefore have been implicitly to admit, not the superior rank and precedence of Rome, which Constantinople has never denied, but its universality of jurisdiction, against which the title of the Patriarch of Constantinople was a standing and effective protest. The sincerity of the line taken up by the Pope may fairly be questioned, when it is remembered that the Legates of Leo I. at the Council of Chalcedon had not hesitated to claim for him the titles of 'Bishop and Pope of the Universal Church,' and that no rejection or disclaimer ever emanated from Leo himself or any of his successors; who, contrariwise, aimed at making them represent substantial power, and not mere honorary rank.

Pelagius II. died in 590, after a pontificate of twelve years, and was succeeded by the illustrious Gregory, one of the four really great men who have sat in the Papal Chair (a rank he shares with Leo I., Gregory VII., and Innocent III.); and he is also one of the four Popes who alone have been distinguished as theologians (Leo I. and Innocent III. again, and Benedict XIV. being his sole competitors), while as an active reformer in various fields of ecclesiastical activity he is without any rival at all.

It was the genius, not less than the piety and administrative energy, of this famous man—not only the foremost man

¹ Launoi, *Epist.* v., ad Mich. Marollium.

of his
which
than
it, all
pean
devel
world
that
at a
of the
Greg
which
ticular
the m
and c
arose,
of a
far m
privile
Sp
in pul
mona
was, f
and m
of de
See o
and o
and w
he ha
right
of the
And
critica
his tir
with a
logues
he acc
long
titious
in virt
Churc
condit
and es
the B
the L

of his age, but in many respects far in advance of his age—which consolidated the tottering Papacy, restored it to more than the position it had held even under Leo I., and shaped it, albeit half unwittingly, into that powerful factor in European history to which, humanly speaking, the whole bent and development of the Middle Ages, and thence of the modern world, is due. But the very fact that it can be so traced, that we have the most ample proofs of a new departure taken at a definite time by a single man, demonstrates the working of the principle of growth and change. The Papacy which Gregory transmitted to his successors was not that Papacy which he had himself inherited, but in some important particulars a new institution; and the more fully we recognize the manner in which he towers over all the men of his time, and over all the men who followed him till Karl the Great arose, the more certainly do we see that he was the founder of a fresh order of things, and that the Papal monarchy has far more connexion with his biography than with any Petrine privilege.

Sprung from a noble senatorial family, and experienced in public affairs, having attained, before his adoption of the monastic state, the high dignity of Prætor of Rome, Gregory was, first of all things, passionately Roman, in the political and national sense of the term, as well as in the later sense of devotion to the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Apostolic See of the West. With the strong feeling for justice, law, and order which marked the Roman citizen of earlier times, and which he may have inherited from republican ancestors, he had also the traditional sentiment of imperialism, of the right of Rome, as Rome, to rule the world, though the throne of the Augustus had long been transferred to other cities. And as his remarkable abilities included no tincture of critical faculty—even had it been a common endowment in his time—but were found united with but little learning, and with a credulity which has rarely been surpassed, as his *Dialogues* testify, it may readily be understood how thoroughly he accepted the Petrine legend, which had been fully developed long before his time, partly by natural growth, partly by factitious accretion, and believed himself to be S. Peter's heir, and in virtue of that dignity the rightful ruler and arbiter of the Church Universal. This is not the place or time to describe the condition of the Western Empire, dismembered and shattered, and especially the long agony of Italy after the Gothic inroads, the Byzantine reconquest, and the devastating invasion of the Longobards, which made the Papacy the one possible

rallying-point for civilization and order, the one bond of union for the scattered and often feeble Churches of Europe, else threatened by the half-reclaimed barbarism around them, and the consummate fitness of Gregory himself as the one man competent to take the helm and guide the ship of the Church safely through the waves and storm. It is enough to emphasize two points: first, that in his time the last glimmer of secular literature dies down in the socket, and the whole serious authorship of the West, with the rarest exceptions (and those in the fields of poetry and romance), becomes ecclesiastical, nay, almost monastic, only, till the revival of letters in the fifteenth century; and next, his attitude in the dispute with Constantinople on the Patriarchal title.

The former of these factors in the history of Papal development is of the highest significance, as it could hardly have issued otherwise than in an enormous increase of the influence of Rome, confessedly the apex of the Western ecclesiastical system, over the whole area affected; and the only matter for wonder is that so many centuries were needed to crown the edifice which Innocent I. began so early. In considering Gregory's quarrel with Constantinople, it is to be noted that he had spent five years—from 579 to 584—in that city as Papal nuncio, and it is characteristic of the hearty aversion which he always entertained for the Greeks, in his Roman pride of superiority, that he never learnt to read or speak their language, though we have his own admission that no competent and trustworthy interpreters were to be had in Constantinople.¹ There can be little doubt, moreover, that, despite the deference he always showed to the Emperor for the time being, even when imposing distasteful tasks upon him, his keen practical insight recognized the mischievous effect of the Court upon the Church, in promoting servility and laxity; and that he may have reasonably apprehended that too great prominence of the Patriarch of Constantinople in the Christian world might imperil the faith, whenever an heretical emperor might renew the policy of a Constantius, a Valens, or an Anastasius, and work on a pliant tool in the patriarchal chair to force his misbelief upon the Church at large. He knew how unhealthy the Erastian pressure of Justinian's yoke had proved even in Rome, distant as it was from the seat of empire and the intrigues of the palace; and now that the position of the Roman Church was becoming almost daily more independent, he may well have

¹ *Epist.* vii. 30.

held,
of P
Chri
sible
of R
cent

I
with
hims
mark
mak
high
notic
with
the c
andr
again
tend
impo
in th
term
look

Holy
where
noble
the fir
that c
and I
with n
stone,
man's

He c
but
further
before
a pro
Nice
the o

¹ p
copied
would
cite tw
and I
Epist.

²

held, quite apart from his deeply-rooted belief in the privilege of Peter, that the best course for the spiritual interests of Christendom was to depress Constantinople as much as possible, and to achieve that subjection of its chair to that of Rome for which successive Popes had striven for two centuries previous.

In any case, there can be no doubt of the determination with which, whether as Papal secretary or as Pope, he gave himself to the task in question. And it is nevertheless remarkable, with the tact which seldom deserted him, and which makes the chief difference between his diplomacy and the high-handed dictation of Leo I., that in sending the customary notice of his accession to the Eastern prelates, accompanied with his profession of faith, he names the four Patriarchs in the order recognized in the East itself—Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem—thereby conceding a point against which several of his predecessors had steadily contended.¹ Another matter in this immediate connexion is also important—that the confession he sent, long since embodied in the Roman canon law as an integral part, is worded in terms that have a legal bearing which he must have overlooked. It runs thus :—

‘I profess that, as I receive and venerate the Four Books of the Holy Gospel, so I do the Four Councils : to wit, the Nicene, wherein the perverse tenet of Arius is overthrown ; that of Constantinople, wherein the error of Euphemius and Macedonius is refuted ; the first of Ephesus, wherein the impiety of Nestorius is condemned ; that of Chalcedon, moreover, wherein the false teaching of Eutyches and Dioscorus is rejected, I embrace with entire devotion, I observe with most complete approval, because upon them, as upon a squared stone, the edifice of the Holy Faith stands up, and the rule of every man’s life and conduct is based.’²

He extends this profession to the Fifth Council likewise, but in a separate clause ; and the Council of Constance further, in its eighth canon, provided that every new Pope, before his election is proclaimed, shall make before the electors a profession of the faith of the eight General Councils from Nice to Lyons, ‘to be kept unaltered in a single tittle.’ But the omission to draw any distinction, by means of any saving

¹ Baronius (*Ann.* 591, iv.) lays this to the charge of the scribe who copied the letter for transmission, but in that case the Roman copies would have been corrected ; whereas the Benedictine editors of S. Gregory cite twenty manuscripts, all the old printed editions, Joannes Diaconus, and Ivo, as all agreeing in so reading the superscription. S. Greg. *Epist.* i. 25.

² Greg. *Epist.* iii. 53.

clause, between the dogmatic and the disciplinary decrees of these Councils leaves the Popes legally bound by the twenty-eighth canon of Chalcedon; while, if such a saving clause were found, it would not mend matters; for by classing that canon under disciplinary ones only, the Popes would thereby admit that the question of the Primacy of the Roman See belongs to the sphere of discipline alone, and is in no sense part of the Faith.

Gregory's first open dispute with Constantinople took place in 593, in consequence of an appeal made to him by two priests whom the Patriarch had caused to be bastinadoed as a punishment for heresy. He addressed a letter to the Patriarch, remonstrating with him for introducing a punishment unknown to canon law, and urging the duty of giving the accused a canonical trial, if not indeed restoring them, adding that he would himself receive them, should they come to Rome. To the first letter from the Pope, John, probably regarding it as an encroachment on his local and internal jurisdiction—seeing that not even the case of a bishop was at issue, but that of two priests, over whom his authority was unquestionable—vouchsafed no reply. A second remonstrance from S. Gregory did extract an answer, but one so worded that the Pope affects to believe that it cannot have come from John's own pen or dictation, but must emanate from a godless youngster of the patriarchal household; and repeating his suggestions for ending the matter, says significantly that if John will not adopt any of them, they two must quarrel. And he observes, in words which are the sharpest rebuke of the subsequent policy of his own successors:—

'We have been appointed as shepherds, not as persecutors. And the great preacher saith: "Reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering, and doctrine." But that kind of preaching is new and unheard of which extorts faith with blows.'

It is noticeable that no claim as of right to control John is made in this letter, and indeed the most Gregory undertakes to do on his part is to send the appellants back to John with commendatory letters in favour of their restoration. But it would be a mistake to infer thence that he thought himself limited to the power of mutual remonstrance wielded by all bishops, often brought to bear in the past (and, as we shall afterwards see, in later times also) against the Popes themselves, for though he was far too cautious to irritate John by claiming more, yet in writing to John of Syracuse to

¹ *Epist.* iii. 53.

defend
the Mas
the Chu
the Ap
prelate,
in North
See, I k
any fau
the que
humility
See is t
more fo
ment, g
commis
to exhib
to illust
in 595.

In t
condem
ing doc
quently
to the e
it; whe
offendin
and Ar
language
extracts

I. V.

'Tru
am of P
of this m
sense jo
Paul cru
he then
Body in
even th
the Last
sal, who
of the t
this per
heaven
also upo
will asc
High?"

¹ *Ep.*

defend himself from the charge of adopting Greek usages in the Mass, he scouts the very idea, saying:—‘With regard to the Church of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the Apostolic See?’¹ And in another letter to the same prelate, he observes:—‘As for his [the Bishop of Byzacene, in North Africa] saying that he is subject to the Apostolic See, I know not what bishop is not subject to it, if there be any faultiness in bishops. Where faultiness does not raise the question, all are equal, in accordance with the rule of humility.’² In yet a third place he says:—‘The Apostolic See is the Head of all Churches.’ This last assertion is even more formal than the preceding, for it occurs in a legal document, given by way of counsel’s brief, or rather authoritative commission, to an officer of the Papal curia, John the Defensor, to exhibit in Spain.³ All these expressions of opinion serve to illustrate the dispute with Constantinople which broke out in 595.

In that year an appeal was lodged at Rome by a priest condemned at Constantinople for heresy. In the accompanying documents the official title ‘Ecumenical Patriarch’ frequently occurred, and excited Gregory’s ire. Thenceforward, to the end of his life, he never ceased to protest hotly against it; whether in writing to his nuncio at Constantinople, to the offending patriarch, to his fellow-patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, or to the Emperor Maurice and others, his language is uniformly that of strong reprobation. A few extracts will suffice.

1. Writing to John himself, he says:—

‘Truly the Apostle Paul, when he heard some persons saying, “I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas,” in vehement horror of this rending of the Lord’s Body, whereby His members were in a sense joining themselves to other heads, cried out, saying, “Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” If he then shrank from the subjection of the members of the Lord’s Body in sectional fashion to other quasi-heads apart from Christ, even though Apostles, what answer can you make in the trial of the Last Judgment to Christ, the real Head of the Church Universal, who are trying to subject all His members to yourself by means of the title Universal? Who is your pattern, I ask, in the use of this perverse word, save he . . . who saith “I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit also upon the mount of the congregation, in the sides of the north; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the most High?” . . . Truly Peter, the chief Apostle, a member of the Holy

¹ *Epist.* ix. 12.

² *Epist.* ix. 59.

³ *Epist.* xiii. 45, c. 2.

and Universal Church, Paul, Andrew, John, what are they save heads of single flocks, and yet all members under one Head? . . . The Saints before the Law, the Saints under the Law, the Saints under grace, all these make up the body of the Lord, and are reckoned among the members of the Church, but not one of them ever wished to be styled Universal.'

He then goes on to allege that the title had been offered to his own predecessors at the Council of Chalcedon, but rejected by them: a doubly inaccurate statement, though he repeats it elsewhere more than once, since such offer as there was proceeded from no more than three private petitioners from Alexandria at the Council, but not themselves members of it; and there had been no repudiation whatever of the arrogant claims of the legate Paschasinus on behalf of the See of Rome.¹

2. To his deacon Sabinian, he writes: 'To consent to that abominable word is to lose the Faith.'²

3. To the Emperor Maurice he says: 'Lo, Peter received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of binding and loosing is bestowed on him, the care and primacy (*principatus*) of the whole Church is committed to him; and yet he is not called Universal Apostle.' Then, pointing out that the See of Constantinople had produced not heretics only, but heresiarchs, such as Nestorius and Macedonius, so that the assumption of the disputed title by anyone in that Church would make for the fall of the whole Church itself, if the bearer of the title Universal should fall, he adds: 'But far from all Christian hearts be that blasphemous name whereby the honour of all priests is taken away, when madly claimed as his by one only.' And then he calls on the Emperor to interpose and coerce the offender, as not merely injuring the Church, but as derogating by his insolence from the dignity of the Crown, in assuming a title on his private responsibility—a charge which was quite baseless, but which Gregory may possibly have believed.³

In another letter to Maurice, the Pope complains of the slighting way in which his protest had been described as 'frivolous,' and argues that when Antichrist shall call himself God, that, too, is in a sense frivolous, as it concerns only the use of two syllables (*Deus*), but it will be none the less pernicious on that account. And then he adds, 'I confidently assert, that whoso calls himself, or desires to be called, Universal Priest, is the forerunner of Antichrist in his pride, in that through haughtiness he sets himself before others.'⁴

4. To the Empress Constantina he discloses his real feel-

¹ *Epist.* v. 18.

² *Ib.* 19.

³ *Ib.* 20.

⁴ *Epist.* vii. 33.

ings.
had
large

'V
will no
of a s
a wor
for the
sufferi
so suff
by Al
the fa
and en

Jo
and b
or th
the u
his pr
dox,
same
refuse
the t
again
took
needl
quote
gius,
Univ

5.
do no
which
"As
from
are m
order
Never
to ent
for I
to me
which
you to
Pope,
more.
lose t
My h

ings more plainly, showing that jealousy for his own See had more to do with his action than fears for the Church at large :—

‘Wherefore I entreat, in the name of Almighty God, that you will not suffer your Piety’s epoch to be dishonoured by the vain-glory of a single man, nor give your consent in any fashion to so perverse a word. And in this matter let not your Piety look down on me ; for though Gregory’s sins are great enough for him to deserve such sufferings, there are no sins of the Apostle Peter for which he should so suffer in your time. Wherefore I again and again beseech you, by Almighty God, that as your parents, the late Sovereigns, sought the favour of S. Peter the Apostle, so you too would seek it likewise, and endeavour to retain it.’¹

John the Faster died while this controversy was going on, and before the Pope had obtained any satisfaction from him or the Emperor. He was succeeded by Cyriacus, who sent the usual notice of his accession to Rome, accompanied with his profession of faith, which Gregory acknowledged as orthodox, writing to him in terms of congratulation, but at the same time instructing the Papal nuncio at Constantinople to refuse communion with Cyriacus unless he formally renounced the title in dispute ; and when the Patriarch remonstrated against such inconsistent treatment, all the reply he received took the form of fresh protests against his official style. It is needless to cite them, and only two other letters need be quoted in this connexion. They are both addressed to Eulogius, Patriarch of Alexandria. One is a rejection of the title Universal, as applied to Gregory himself :—

5. ‘Your Blessedness has been at the pains to point out that you do not now use, when writing to certain persons, those haughty words which proceed from the root of vanity ; and you accost me, saying : “As you gave orders.” I beg you will withdraw that word “ordering” from my ears, for I know who I am, and who you are. In rank you are my brethren, in character my fathers. Consequently I gave no orders, but I took pains to point out what I thought expedient. Nevertheless, I do not find that your Blessedness has been pleased to entirely bear in mind the very thing I impressed on your memory ; for I said that you ought not to use any such phrase in writing either to me or to anyone else ; and behold, in the preface of your letter, which you sent to me, the very man who had uttered the prohibition, you took pains to use that word of haughty style, calling me Universal Pope, which I beg your Holiness, my very dear friend, not to do any more. I account that no honour in which I perceive that my brethren lose their honour. My honour is the honour of the Church Universal. My honour is the unimpaired position (*solidus vigor*) of my brethren.

¹ *Epist. v. 21.*

I am then truly honoured, when their rightful honour is not withheld from any one of them.'¹

The other letter is more remarkable still, being one in which he endeavours to persuade Eulogius, as he had also tried to persuade the Patriarch of Antioch, to make common cause with him against Constantinople, which they were far too prudent to do. The interesting clauses follow:—

6. 'Your very dear Holiness has said much in your letters to me about the Chair of S. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, observing that he continues even now sitting there in the person of his successors. . . . And though that especial honour is no pleasure to myself, yet I am very glad that what your Holiness gives to me, you also give to yourself. . . . For whereas there are many Apostles, yet in respect of the Primacy, only the See of the Prince of the Apostles, which is his singly in three places, has prevailed as authoritative. For he dignified that See in which he was pleased also to rest and to end his life. He adorned the See to which he sent his disciple the Evangelist. He established the See wherein he sate seven years, though about to quit it. Seeing then that the See, in which three Bishops now preside by divine authority, is one and belongs to one, whatever good I hear of you, I count as my own. And if you believe any good of me, set it down to your own merits, for we are one in Him who saith: That they may all be one, as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.'²

The intention of this ingenious appeal was obviously to persuade the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch to make common cause with Rome against Constantinople, as an upstart aggressor which was impugning the Petrine rank and privilege common in some sense to all three. But while its wording is, in one aspect, inconsistent with attributing exclusive pre-eminence to Rome, seeming to put the Primacy as it were in commission; yet between the lines may be read without difficulty that Gregory meant just as much as Napoleon Bonaparte, as First Consul, meant when he had occasion to couple the names of Cambacérès and Lebrun with his own in any political document.

The controversial value of his utterances on the title of Universal has now to be briefly considered, as it has been unduly maximized and minimized from opposite standpoints.

What it certainly does not imply in Gregory's mouth is any recession from the attitude taken up by his predecessors. He had no thought of abandoning the policy of Leo and Gelasius. He was as convinced as they were that he inherited a very real jurisdiction over the whole Church in right of heir-

¹ *Epist.* viii. 30.

² *Epist.* vii. 40.

ship
kind
advan
alrea
secur
Cons
to be
for hi
sake
the a
comp
the tr
with
who
royal
O
that C
His a
such
made
looked
for he
sentin
collea
of the
to enc
script
are as
brand
more
suppor
itself
exerci
no par
on tha
ents o
that sy
God, t
the ve
upon
differe
and af
advant
the ci
magist

ship to S. Peter; and in point of fact the degree, area, and kind of authority which he practically exercised was far in advance of any which they enjoyed. It was, as has been already said, more for the privilege of his See than for the security of the faith that he contended so earnestly against Constantinople, though he probably believed the two questions to be inseparably united. And his rejection of the title Universal for himself must therefore be regarded as mainly done for the sake of consistency, inasmuch as he had based his protests on the abstract unfitness of the word itself, and not on the incompetency of the Patriarch of Constantinople to use it. But the truth is that this rejection may be not unfairly compared with the rejection of the title of King by Julius and Augustus, who not the less wielded, and meant to wield, more than royal power under republican forms.

On the other hand, however, there is no reason to suppose that Gregory had any ambition to stretch his powers yet further. His arguments remain perfectly valid against the action of such of his successors as Boniface VIII. and Pius IX., who made fresh departures in the form of their claims. Gregory looked on the Papacy as he did on the privilege of Peter; for he considered both to be given to individuals as representing the Church, and being, as it were, trustees for all their colleagues, yet not as empowering them to act independently of the Church, to override the canons which bound others, or to encroach upon the rights secured to those others by prescription or enactment. Logically, it is true, his objections are as valid against the Leonine Papacy as against the Hildebrandine, but he was not conscious of the fact; and it no more occurred to him or to any of his contemporaries, whether supporting or resisting his demands, to inquire in Scripture itself what degree of authority was actually vested in and exercised by S. Peter in virtue of his alleged privilege (though no particle of evidence, however minute, is elsewhere extant on that subject), than it occurred to the champions or opponents of Calvinism, ten centuries later, to consider how far that system could be morally reconciled with the character of God, though these investigations seem to the modern mind the very first which a searcher after the truth would enter upon in the two cases. What really constitutes the main difference between Gregory the Great and those Popes before and after him who pressed on the claims of the Papacy is the advantage he derived, like S. Ambrose, from his training in the civil service and his experience as a powerful secular magistrate. This coloured his action far more than his mo-

nastic habits, on which much more stress has been commonly laid, since he was the first monk to ascend the Papal chair. He was enabled to view questions from their lay as well as from their ecclesiastical side; he had acquired a working knowledge of what was practicable as well as abstractedly desirable; he understood the advantage to the ruling power from spontaneous cession on the part of its subordinates, as compared with their enforced submission; he had learnt a degree of respect and deference for the State within its own sphere which has been usually absent from the mere ecclesiastic; and, above all, he had fully mastered the important maxim that in administrative politics the best plan is to do things instead of talking about them.

Hence the appellate system of Rome, to which so much of its influence has been due, developed under him to an extent without parallel previously, while his quasi-Patriarchal authority was acknowledged not only in territories such as Gaul, Spain, and Britain, lying far beyond his legitimate jurisdiction, but, what is more remarkable, in provinces of North Italy, like Milan and Ravenna, which had till then jealously guarded their independence. It is true that he failed in his efforts to end the schism of Aquileia, but that was but a trifling check in an otherwise triumphant career.

When we seek to analyse the causes of this success, which makes Gregory the Great the true founder of the mediæval Papacy, they are reducible to three. First comes his rank as a theologian. It was said above that he shares this dignity with no more than three other Popes; but that much understates his position, for he is always accounted as one of the Four Latin Doctors, ranked as he is with SS. Augustine, Jerome, and Ambrose. And though in truth he is scarcely entitled to be placed so high, not being comparable as a scientific divine to Leo the Great, or to the chief mediæval theologians, yet the instinct which so classed him was not wrong. He is fully the equal of S. Ambrose, while S. Leo had dealt with speculations more germane to Eastern than to Western thought, which has always tended more to the anthropological side of Christian dogma than to its theological side, so that he never could achieve popularity; and S. Jerome's devotion to Biblical criticism can scarcely be said to have had any Western imitators till the dawn of the modern era. S. Augustine was doubtless far above the level of Gregory in mental force, but the disapproval felt in the Eastern Church for those theories of his which gave birth to predestinarianism

has
he
agai
know
was
has
faile
part
in t
mos
of C
from
coul
cha
will
thor
whi
sixt
wou
be c
wea
plet
cess
the
bein
his
pop
tha
ma
son
the
lett
mal
the
dire
refe
the
the
of

doe
nop
teac
nam
Mar
the

has all along weakened his credit there,¹ whereas Gregory was held in high esteem, in despite of the war he carried on against the chief Oriental See, and the fact that he was acknowledged in his very lifetime by the East as a great teacher was not without contemporary influence in the West also. It has been already shown how several of his predecessors had failed, from the ignorance of theology which has for the most part prevailed in the local Church of Rome, to decide rightly in the controversies which came before them; but now the most eminent divine of his day was seated in the chief See of Christendom, and it was felt universally that, even apart from his commanding rank, no equally competent arbiter could be found. What is even more, the weight of his moral character told. It was widely felt (though some exceptions will be noted presently) that here was a man who could be thoroughly trusted, who had a love of justice for its own sake, which, never too common, was the rarest of endowments in the sixth century, and that cases laid before him for adjudication would not only be dealt with by a trained business mind, but be decided honestly on the merits, without fear or favour. A weak man in the Papal chair at that crisis would have completed the ruin begun by Vigilius and his immediate successors; but Gregory was the strongest man of his time, and the deference which was in truth due to his personal qualities being attributed, by a very natural confusion of thought, to his official position, enabled him to rehabilitate the Papacy in popular esteem, and to make it practically far more powerful than it had been under even those of his predecessors who made much larger demands in words, but who did not personally interpose in civil and ecclesiastical affairs throughout the West to anything like the extent which S. Gregory's letters reveal. His predecessors had been in the habit of making loud and large claims for their See, and of thrusting themselves into local controversies with which they had no direct concern, not content with such cases as were voluntarily referred to them. Consequently, though they succeeded, in the long run, in building up the fabric of Papal jurisdiction, they often met with serious and public rebuffs, and lost much of the ground which had been gained by slow and toilsome

¹ S. Augustine's name (as, indeed, those of S. Jerome and S. Gregory) does not so much as appear in the Kalendar of the Church of Constantinople, whereas S. John Cassian, who represents a different school of teaching on election and grace, is commemorated there; while Cassian's name is limited in the West to the Kalendar of the single diocese of Marseilles, where, however, it has an octave. S. Ambrose and S. Leo the Great are in the Kalendar of Constantinople.

effort. But Gregory said comparatively little about his own rights, while despatching promptly, and, on the whole, wisely and justly, the enormous mass of cases spontaneously referred from all parts of the West to his decision. He thus established a vast number of precedents, nearly all due to voluntary consent of the parties concerned, and scarcely any extorted by pressure from Rome, so that no resistance or protest was aroused; and accordingly it appeared to the next generation, and to many later ones, that the authority which was really due to S. Gregory's personal character was a privilege immemorially and divinely annexed to the great office which he held.

It has been remarked above that S. Gregory had much more respect for the civil power than has been traditional in his See, and a few leading examples of his obedience in difficult circumstances merit to be cited.

First may be named his dealings with the Istrian Bishops, who stood out firmly in defence of the Three Chapters. He obtained an edict from the Emperor commanding them to attend a synod to be convoked at Rome. But as several of the Istrian sees lay outside the limits of the Empire, being within the Lombard kingdom, two separate episcopal assemblies were convened by the Metropolitan to consider the summons. Both agreed to send a petition to the Emperor to reconsider his edict, and that no one should obey the Pope's summons till a reply had come from Constantinople. The petition is extant, and sets forth that, in adhering to the Three Chapters, the Bishops of Istria are simply upholding the Council of Chalcedon and the positive injunction of Pope Vigilius, enforced with anathemas; that the edict commanding them to go for trial to Rome had been surreptitiously obtained by their enemies through misrepresentation; that as Pope Gregory was himself a party in the controversy, and had taken up a definite line in opposition to theirs, his judgment in the matter was a foregone conclusion, whereas it was against the laws of the Empire that any man should sit to try his own opponents; that if they were to condemn the Three Chapters, or even hold communion with the Pope who had done so, all their flocks would abandon them, and would transfer themselves to the jurisdiction of the Gallic Bishops, to the injury of Imperial interests in North Italy. On all these grounds they besought the Emperor to withdraw the edict, and to leave them in peace.¹ Maurice assented, and

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 590, § xxviii.

wrote to Gregory, saying, 'We command your Holiness to give no further trouble to these Bishops.'¹ And we have Gregory's own testimony, in a letter to John of Ravenna, that he at once complied with this command, though purposing to apply for its withdrawal.²

A second and, in some respects, even more remarkable, case is that of Maximus, a presbyter of the diocese of Salona, who was consecrated to the vacant see by the Bishops of Dalmatia, in opposition to Honoratus, whom the clergy of Salona had elected; a result due, as was alleged, to simony on the part of Maximus, and despite his evil repute otherwise. Gregory wrote to annul the consecration, and to forbid the Bishops of Dalmatia, by the authority of S. Peter, to consecrate anyone without the licence of the Apostolic See.³ But in the meanwhile the Imperial confirmation of Maximus's election arrived at Salona; and, deeply mortified as Gregory was when he learned it, and still more when a second rescript from Constantinople enjoined him to discontinue proceedings he had begun against Maximus, but which the latter had treated with open contempt, yet he ultimately agreed to a compromise arranged by the Exarch of Ravenna at the Emperor's orders, withdrew his excommunication of Maximus, and, what is most noticeable of all, retracted his demand that Maximus should be tried at Rome. For the contention of Maximus and his friends was that the canons were clear and decisive in decreeing that ecclesiastical causes were to be tried and decided on the spot where they arose, and not evoked elsewhere by appeal, or by any claim of original jurisdiction at Rome; so that the Pope was going beyond his rights in claiming to hear and decide causes at Rome, though it was unquestionable that this very claim had not only been made but acted on by several of Gregory's predecessors. And the fact that the Pope had to yield the point establishes that no valid basis for the claim in question was known to exist at the time.

The third instance to be cited is one which touched the Pope's personal feelings more closely, as it was an Imperial edict forbidding soldiers to adopt the monastic life till their term of military service had expired. A rescript from Constantinople directed the Pope to publish this edict in all the western provinces of the Empire, and he at once addressed a warm but perfectly respectful remonstrance against it to Maurice and his son Theodosius, entreating its recall as con-

¹ 'Jubemus tuam Sanctitatem nullatenus molestiam eisdem episcopis inferre.' Baron. *Ann.* 590, § xxviii.

² *Epist.* ii. 46.

³ *Ibid.* iv. 10.

trary to the interests of religion, but at the same time declaring that, as being subject to command ('*ego quidem jussioni subjectus*'), he had taken care to have the publication duly made, and had thus doubly discharged his duty by obedience to the Emperor on the one hand, and by speaking his mind freely for God on the other.¹ He sent this letter, not in the usual course through his nuncio, but through Theodore, the Court physician, to whom he wrote privately at the same time, complaining of the law as one originally devised by Julian the Apostate, and as likely to be hurtful to both the army itself and to the Church, but admitting the Emperor's legal right to enforce it, and to call on the clergy to promote obedience to it, in these noticeable words, curiously unlike as they are to utterances of Gregory VII.: 'It seems very hard to me that the Emperor should forbid his soldiers to serve Him who has given him all things, and granted him dominion not only over soldiers, but over priests also.'² Yet, though the Pope obeyed, it was not gladly; and the frequent rebuffs he thus met at the hands of the Emperor Maurice, whose demeanour towards him seems to have been always cold and distant, not frankly recognizing his priceless services to law, order, and recuperative effort in Italy, and who, as a financier desirous of restoring the credit of the Empire, pressed hardly by his taxes on the impoverished peasantry, led Gregory to commit the one great fault which stains a singularly noble and devoted life—the indecent and almost blasphemous acclaim of congratulation which he addressed to the ruffian Phocas after his usurpation of the throne and murder of the Emperor and his family.³

There are yet two elements of Gregory's character and acts which powerfully contributed to the aggrandisement of the Roman See—one operating almost at once, and the other not till some centuries later. The first is the missionary zeal which so honourably distinguishes him from all his predecessors, with the one doubtful exception of Celestine I., if any credit may be attached to Prosper's assertions, that it was he who sent Germanus and Lupus to combat the Pelagian heresy in Britain, and Palladius to convert the heathen of Ireland—facts as to which there are contradictory statements. But there is no question at all as to the facts of Gregory's active labours amongst the Arian Lombards, his promotion of Catholicism in Spain (though the revival of orthodoxy there slightly precedes his accession to the Papacy), and, above all,

¹ *Epist.* iii. 65.² *Ibid.* 66.³ *Ibid.* xiii. 31.

his mission of the monk Augustine to Ethelbert, King of Kent, whence the Anglo-Saxon Church took its rise, and was finally moulded, although the mission at Canterbury had in truth but very moderate success, and the chief part in the extirpation of Saxon heathenism is due to the Scoto-Irish missionaries, who acknowledged no subjection to the Roman Chair.

Two citations will sufficiently show how far the Celtic Churches were from recognizing, or being even familiar with, the Papal claims, though the once Celtic dioceses of Gaul had come, under their new Frankish rulers, into much subjection to the Roman See, owing in no little measure to Gregory's unwearied toils for the reformation of the many abuses and scandals with which they swarmed in his day. First comes a letter from the Bishops of Ireland, now lost, but whose terms are recoverable from the wording of Gregory's answer. It was despatched in 592, and appears to have been a complaint of some persecution they had suffered, and to have told the Pope that the invasion of the Lombards, and all the evils which Rome and Italy in general had suffered at their hands, were Divine judgments on the Popes for having consented to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and having thus rebelled against the decrees of Chalcedon.¹ The second is a letter on the subject of Easter observance, addressed to S. Gregory by S. Columbanus, the famous Irish missionary and monastic founder, who was a Quartodeciman in practice. He rested his case on the authority of Anatolius of Laodicea (*circa* 269), approved by S. Jerome, and rejected that of Victorius, whose computation, drawn up at the instance of Pope Hilarus, was accepted at Rome. S. Columbanus, while formally asking S. Gregory's opinion, tells him that anyone who rejects S. Jerome's view will be rejected by the Western (*i.e.* the Irish) Churches as a heretic.²

To these testimonies may be added the not less remarkable reply made by Dinoh, Abbot of Bangor-Iscoed, to the claims of the Roman missionaries at the Synod of S. Augustine's Oak:—

'Be it known to you, without any ambiguity, that we all and singly are obedient to the Pope of Rome, and to every true and devout Christian, to love each in his own order with perfect charity, and to aid each one of them to become sons of God in word and deed. And I know not of any other obedience than this due to him whom ye style Pope, nor that he has a claim and right to be Father of Fathers.

¹ Baron. *Ann.* 592, § vi.

² *Biblioth. Patr.* (Lugd.), xii. 31; Fleury, *H. E.* viii. 212.

And the aforesaid obedience we are ready to yield at once to him and to every Christian. Further, we are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Caerleon-upon-Usk, who is, under God, appointed to oversee us, and to make us keep the spiritual path.' ¹

The other matter which ultimately helped forward the Roman claims was the ardent patronage of monachism which Gregory, himself a devout monk, steadily practised, and chiefly the exemption from episcopal jurisdiction which he granted to monasteries in the Lateran Synod of 601, which was the beginning of that special devotion to the Curia which made the regulars a Papal militia in every country of the West, and enabled them to subvert even the small measure of independence which the False Decretals had left to the Bishops and secular clergy. Gregory died in March 604, after an eventful pontificate of more than thirteen years, but before he had reaped any substantial advantage for his See from the favour of Phocas, for which he had made interest with that monarch's consort, Leontia.² It was Boniface III., his next successor but one (Sabinian, who actually succeeded him, sat but a few months), who obtained from the usurper the celebrated decree, recorded by Paulus Diaconus, and reproduced from him by Beda, and later by Anastasius the Librarian: 'That the See of Rome and of the Apostolic Church should be the Head of all Churches, whereas (*quia*) the Church of Constantinople had been wont to style itself first of all Churches.'³

¹ Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, i. 122.

² *Epist.* xiii. 39.

³ Paul. Diac. *De Gest. Langobard.* iv. 7; Beda *Venerab. De Sex Ætat. Mundi*; Anastas. *Biblioth. Vit. Bonifacii III.*

ART

1. L

2. M

3. L

4. L

5. D

6. D

7. L

8. L

SOCI

late

this

Euro

activ

whic

in a

acco

This

being

catic

men

justl

own

ing,

I

pers

guar

or su

or r

ART. VII.—PHASES OF CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM
ABROAD.

1. *Le Socialisme Contemporain.* Par EMILE DE LAVELEYE. 2ème Ed. (Paris, 1883.)
2. *Mélanges de Politique et d'Economie.* Par CHARLES PÉRIN. (Paris, 1883.)
3. *L'Economie Politique dans ses Rapports avec la Loi Morale.* Par le Comte DE BRÉDA. 'L'Association Catholique, Revue des Questions Sociales et Ouvrières.' Tomes XIV, XV. (Paris, 1882-3.)
4. *Les Doctrines Economiques depuis un Siècle.* Par CHARLES PÉRIN. (Paris, 1880.)
5. *Die Volkswirtschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen.* Von GEORG RATZINGER. (Freiburg i. B., 1881.)
6. *Der radicale deutsche Socialismus und die Christliche Gesellschaft.* Von RUDOLF TODT. (Wittenberg, 1878.)
7. *Les Syndicats Professionnels.* Discours prononcé à la Chambre des Députés. Par le Comte ALBERT DE MUN. (Paris, 1883.)
8. *L'Organisation Coopérative du Travail National.* Par JEAN LOESEVITZ, Rédacteur du 'Monde.' (Paris, 1883.)

SOCIALISM, after a season of comparative quiescence, has of late once more assumed a threatening attitude. It is at this moment producing considerable agitation in several European countries, and has been the subject of diplomatical activity among their Governments. Now, every movement which is strong enough to engage public attention will appear in a different light to different individuals and bodies of men according to their personal standpoint or corporate position. This applies more especially to movements affecting the well-being of society, as a whole, inasmuch as they aim at modifications in the existing order vitally affecting large classes of men. The Church and the religious world, therefore, may justly regard the socialistic movement of the day from their own standpoint without incurring, or at least without meriting, the charge of 'religious bias.'

In proportion as the religious interest is to religious persons chief in importance, they will naturally endeavour to guard it with a godly jealousy against adverse influences, real or supposed, arising from political or economic modifications or rearrangements such as are proposed by the would-be

improvers of society. If the socialistic movement of the day has not attracted to any great extent the attention of the religious world in this country, it is chiefly owing to the fact that to all outward appearances it has not yet taken root on British soil to the same extent as on the Continent. When in the more stormy days of 1848 a wave of Socialism passed over England, a body of Christian Socialists immediately arose, with Maurice at their head and Kingsley for their spokesman, who claimed the right of the Church to take up a prominent position in relation to what appeared then a formidable social movement. With the disappearance of Chartism, the Christian Socialist movement, too, collapsed. It must not be supposed, however, that the causes of social discontent have been removed altogether. Far from it. The mass meeting in Nottingham of late, and others, organized by the 'Democratic Federation' for purposes of social agitation, and which were attended by thousands of working men; the large sale of Mr. Henry George's now famous work on *Progress and Poverty*, in a cheap and popular form; and many other facts and figures we could mention, prove the existence of a widely-extended socialistic propaganda in the great centres of British industry, and of late, too, in country districts.¹ It would be the height of imprudence to ignore the fact. For the social problem, supposing it to exist, must be faced sooner or later, as, no doubt, it is capable of a satisfactory solution on Christian principles. A reconciliation of conflicting class differences on the basis of Christian justice and liberality ought, at least, to be attempted. The spread of Christian knowledge and the formation of Christian character among the labouring classes under Church influence would go far towards reconciling them to their present position, whilst at the same time enabling them to improve it by their own exertions. It is well, therefore, not to under-estimate the force and direction of the movement in question, nor to neglect its study, but to appreciate the intimate connection which exists between Socialism in the best sense of the word and Christian philanthropy.

Such is the line of thought taken up by Christian Socialism. Its main object is to establish the kinship between the genius of Christianity and that 'passionate faith in the illimitable possibilities of human progress' which has been variously expressed in the schemes put forward at different

¹ See *The Coming Revolution in England*, by H. M. Hyndman, and other works by the same author, published at the office of the *Christian Socialist*, 138 Fleet Street.

times
name
Soci
bring
econ
bring
velop
ultim
vious
the a
tant
these
bring
by r
(at l
const
Yet
much
histo
sacra
T
corn
prese
found
syste
plete
the M
delle
work
law,
to th
genu
More
rence
ideal
porat
worl
way
symp
the h

1
chaps
contai
perism
cf. Lo

times by those social idealists who now go under the general name of Socialists. But the distinguishing mark of Christian Socialism is its firm faith in the power of Christian ethics to bring about a complete transformation of our industrial economy. Hence its main efforts are directed towards bringing about a reconciliation of classes with the fuller development of the passive virtues of Christianity, and so ultimately a regeneration of society as the result of a previous improvement in the individual. From the growth of the active virtues of Christianity among all, it expects important social reforms, founded on Christian principle; and these are to remove the causes of social discontent, and so bring about social peace; in short, Christian Socialism works by means of spiritual *dynamics*, whereas Socialism proper (at least in its most recent forms) aims at a *mechanical* reconstruction of society on purely materialistic principles. Yet notwithstanding their essential differences, both have much in common, and are frequently met in company in the historical development of European society. 'Homo res sacra homini.'

Thus from the very first, when Christianity appeared in a corner of the Roman Empire, the constitution of the Church presented a new 'type of social union,' that of a 'brotherhood founded in devotion and self-sacrifice,' to replace the ancient system of oppression and slavery, promising to effect a complete change in the complexion of society. Passages from the Fathers, such as those quoted by the Socialist Villegardelle, and expressions to be found here and there in the works of Thomas Aquinas, the general tenor of the Canon law, and the history of ecclesiastical politics from the fourth to the fourteenth century, all bear witness to the spirit of genuine sympathy with God's poor in the Christian Church.¹ Moreover, it is interesting to note the synchronizing recurrence of religious revivals, and the resuscitation of social ideals during marked epochs of history: *e.g.* the contemporaneous struggles for freedom both in the Church and the world in the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. In the same way great social movements in their turn have awakened the sympathies and quickened the life of religious bodies: witness the humanitarian influence of the French Revolution on the

¹ See Villegardelle, *Histoire des Idées Sociales avant la Révolution*, chaps. iii. and iv.; cp. S. Augustine's Sermons, No. 325 and 326, which contain a picture of the common life at Hippo. Mammonism and Pauperism, according to S. Thomas Aquinas, are twins born of Egotism: cf. *Loc. Commun., Theol.* II. ii. Quæst. 118, art. viii.

social tendencies of the Methodist revival. So, too, in the present day, the universal diffusion of socialistic ideas is accompanied by various manifestations of Christian Socialism in the principal countries of civilized Europe. As the eye travels over the map, different countries at once call up before the mind figures of prominent Christian Socialists in every direction. The Scandinavian North suggests the venerable Bishop of Zealand, and his work on *Socialism and Christianity, as a Fragment of Christian Ethics*; Italy reminds us of the social studies of Rafaele Mariano in his work on *Christian Catholicism and Culture*. France, the most prolific country in the production of every species of modern Socialism, also suggests a long series of eminent Christian Socialists, from De Maistre to le Comte de Mun, from Lamennais to Le Play. Belgium in the West points to C. Périn and E. de Laveleye; Austria in the East to Baron von Vogelsang. Germany, the classical country of scientific Socialism, has also its two branches of Christian Socialism. The elder branch is represented by prelates and dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Communion, by an ably conducted social press, and latterly by an historical and economic literature, in which the writers, such as Ratzinger, Hitze, and Albertus (the latter is a *nom de plume*), take for their basis the teaching of the Catholic Church. The younger branch is represented by distinguished laymen, such as the Privy Councillor Wagener (now retired), and the Berlin Professor of Political Economy, A. Wagner, as well as by Churchmen of learning and rank, such as R. Todt and the Court Chaplain Stöcker. In short, there never was a time when Christian Socialism was so widely spread and so powerfully represented in the press, in politics, and in society, as in the present day. It demands, therefore, our respectful attention, more especially when taken in connection with the great social crisis which has produced it.

In the present paper we must confine ourselves to a short and succinct account of the projects and prospects of Christian Socialism as represented by some of the most recent and most distinguished writers, both Catholic and Protestant, on the continent of Europe. The Duke of Saint-Simon, as the author of the *Nouveau Christianisme*, has been called the father of Christian Socialism; but, without disputing his prior claims to the title, we must turn to forms more recent and more positively religious than his in our survey of the movement in France. From the very first, and still more so of late years, peculiar circumstances have produced two tenden-

cies.
One
which
1793
of I
refo
and
of n
imp
L
exis
arra
eigh
tury
the
mea
to th
men
and
socie
Reve
of in
revo
vidu
petit
who
prod
class
thou
their
pract
stand
Thus
the l
which
and
the
resist
confl
of ov
of ev
spero
tiona
later
the p

ciés, if not two schools, of Christian Socialism in that country. One of them is connected with the reactionary movements which followed upon the two great social revolutions in 1793 and 1848 respectively; the other, assuming the form of Liberal Catholicism, is mainly influenced by the social reformatory movements between the two revolutions of 1830 and 1848, and, endeavouring to adapt itself to the exigencies of modern society, adopts corresponding methods of social improvement.

Both, however, are at one in the remonstrance against existing social evils, as the result of political changes and arrangements founded on the Deistic philosophy of the eighteenth, or the materialistic creeds of the nineteenth century. Both look to the resuscitation of Christian beliefs and the 'rehabilitation' of Church influence as the only possible means of saving society. There are differences of opinion as to the methods of treatment, though there is perfect agreement in the diagnosis of the social disease. Ultramontanes and liberal Catholics alike ascribe the disorders from which society is suffering, to the combined effects of the first French Revolution and the almost contemporaneous revolution of industry through the use of steam and machinery. The revolution, they say, in removing every restraint to individual freedom, introduced the principle of unlimited competition. But the latter enables the capitalist or manufacturer, who is in possession of all the implements of labour and production, to grow rich at the expense of the wage-earning classes. The latter depend on him for employment, so that, though legally—on the principle of free contract—making their bargain with the employer of labour on equal terms, they practically become in course of time, and by force of circumstances, mere appendages of the machine at which they work. Thus the Revolution, whilst upholding perfect equality before the law, has established a great inequality of social condition, which gives a keen edge to the antagonisms between the men and their masters, the former demanding a larger share in the distribution of wealth, the latter either systematically resisting or reluctantly admitting their claims. This strife of conflicting interests is aggravated by the evil consequences of over-production and hazardous speculation, since the effects of every monetary crisis are felt more acutely by the least prosperous portion of the community, and resented as an additional social injustice. All this, it is asserted, must sooner or later lead to a pitched battle between the large majority of the people on the verge of pauperism, and a rapidly diminish-

ing minority who happen to be the sole owners of all the factors of industry excepting manual labour—a civil war threatening the very existence of our modern civilization, as was shown in the short episode of the Commune established in Paris twelve years ago.

Society thus being in danger, nothing can save it but the revival of Christian sentiment, which would restore a profound sense of social duty and devotion in all classes, counteracting the corroding influences of materialistic egotism, and instilling the spirit of love and order in the heart of society, as a means of reforming it from within, on the basis of mutual toleration and co-operation, exemplified in the constitution of the Christian Church.

These are the leading principles of the two sections of French Christian Socialism. Their differences are in the application, one side leaning more towards the unconditional surrender to Church authority for compassing these social aims, the other inclined more towards a philosophical application of the principles of equal rights and reciprocal duties laid down in the New Testament. De Maistre, Lamennais, Lacordaire, on the one hand; Bonald, Le Play, and le Comte de Mun on the other; represent in the order we have placed them—though not in chronological sequence—the ascending and descending scale from and to the Ultramontane standpoint of Christian Socialism. It corresponds with, as it was affected by, a similar contemporaneous oscillation between the policy of reaction and revolution in the public mind of France.

What are their distinguishing characteristics will best be seen from a short comparative view of the more liberal system of social reform by Le Play, and the more pronounced ecclesiastical programme of le Comte de Mun.

Le Play, although by his own confession a disciple of Bonald—‘the most important politician of French Ultramontanism’—is by no means a blind follower of his master’s teaching, except in his negative criticism of the ‘principles of 1789.’ In this respect both may be said to take for their motto De Maistre’s paradox: ‘Si la contre-révolution n’est pas divine, elle est nulle.’ In other respects Le Play, as a layman and scientist, is unhampered by religious prejudices in his social inquiries. In fact, up to the close of his career—that is, not until shortly before his death (April 15, 1882)—when he wrote a letter full of filial devotion to the Pope, Le Play’s orthodoxy was by no means regarded as above suspicion. His works, though received with grateful recog-

niti
sub
less
epit
rate
et s

the
for
ticu
cons
Divi
plai
he a
obse
The
hun
and
‘Pro
writ
tion
mos
in th
it is
lette
unit
new
told
Fran
Sim
soci
doct
and
of
Des
all p
pend
tific
Uni
in al
Minc
As t
Com
and
clusi
vo

dition of the services they had rendered to religion, were subjected to severe scrutiny by the spirited champions of a less tolerant Catholicism than his own. Perhaps the pithy epithet applied to him by Sainte-Beuve defines most accurately his religious standpoint: 'Un Bonald rajeuni, progressif, et scientifique.'

What entitles him to the name of Christian Socialist is the importance he assigns to religion in any possible scheme for the regeneration of society, and French society in particular. 'Social science,' he says, 'leads its true observers constantly back to the principles of the Divine law.' The Divine law with him is the 'everlasting Decalogue,' as explained in the Sermon on the Mount. That is the conclusion he arrives at as the result of half a century's travels and observations, in different countries of Europe and the East. The mass of materials thus collected and laid down in several hundred monographs, will prove invaluable (if carefully sifted and arranged), as the basis for any future work on the 'Prolegomena of Christian Sociology,' which has yet to be written. As the founder of the 'Unions de Paix,' associations for the promotion of social peace, Le Play is one of the most remarkable as well as one of the most successful pioneers in the social 'ministry of reconciliation,' whose great object it is, in the words of S. Augustine, quoted by Le Play in his letter to Leo XIII. already referred to: 'ut multitudo in unitate pacis constituatur.' What led Le Play to adopt this new line of studying the social problem of the day, we are told by himself. He left school at a time when youths in France were carried away by the captivating theories of Saint-Simonism, and threw themselves heart and soul into the socialistic movement. Le Play, unable to accept their doctrines, was yet at a loss for arguments to refute them, and so he determined to find out for himself the real causes of social discontent as well as their remedies. Taking Descartes for his guide, he determined to divest his mind of all preconceived opinions, and set out on a voyage of independent research. In his travels, whilst pursuing his scientific studies as Professor of Metallurgy in the French University, he had opportunities of observing the life of families in all parts of the world. His position as General Inspector of Mines gave him special facilities for conducting such inquiries. As the trusted counsellor of Napoleon III., and the Chief Commissioner of the three Universal Exhibitions in London and Paris, he had ample means of verifying his own conclusions by useful information obtained from persons in

authority. In his social studies he proceeded strictly on the principles of experiment and verification, treating the family as the molecule of social life, and the social question itself like a problem in chemistry. To master the minute details of domestic economy, he would often reside for a considerable time in the same house or locality, so as to make sure of sufficient data to build his theory upon. That theory he calls the theory of imitation, as distinguished from all others, which he calls theories of invention. The latter are deduced entirely, he says, from the abstract principles in the imaginative brains of the propounders. His own system is founded on an accurate induction of facts. What he demands is a close imitation of the manners and social habits of the most prosperous nations who have reached the highest level of mental, moral, and material development. Le Play's principal work, *La Réforme Sociale*, made its appearance in 1864, and has since passed through six editions. What gives the work a peculiar interest is the wonderful perspicuity, almost amounting to prophetic vision, in which at that early date the author diagnosed the symptoms of that social cancer which reached its crisis seven years later, and from which French society has not yet recovered.

The central idea of Le Play's system is the reconstitution of society on the model of the family; as, indeed, he ascribes, in a measure, the dissolution of French society to the unhealthy development of family life. The family is the type of stability and order. Here in the happy union of benign authority in the patriarchal head and dutiful obedience in the household is bred that reverential regard for law, and deferential use of liberty, so rarely met united in our modern social arrangements. Here, too, is the common ground for the cultivation of that spirit of devotion and self-discipline which are the fundamental pre-requisites of a healthy and harmonious development of social life. The 'patronage libre' as existing in the family may be extended to the factory; and the creation of a new order of merit, the 'social authorities,' is to supply the place of an influential aristocracy such as exists still in England, where the landed gentry, according to Le Play, watch with paternal solicitude over the temporal and spiritual welfare of the people. This 'hierarchy of merit' is to consist of men most distinguished for their success, not only in industrial enterprise or agriculture, but also in having established a happy relationship with those in their employ.

It has been said that the doctrine of Le Play resolves

itself into a doctrine of social authorities. But there is an intimate connexion between authority and tradition, and so we must not be astonished to see in Le Play's system regretful glances cast backwards on the traditional habits of the past, and an inclination to ascribe the social decay of his country to a disregard for them on the part of modern innovators. For, he says, contrasting the methods of material progress with the moral deterioration peculiar to an age of scientific discovery: 'La réforme des mœurs n'est point subordonnée à l'invention de nouvelles doctrines; car l'esprit d'innovation est aussi stérile dans l'ordre moral qu'il est fécond dans l'ordre matériel.'

Here, then, is the meeting-point between Le Play and his Ultramontane allies—*i.e.* on the common ground of traditional beliefs; both take their stand on the rule laid down at the Council of Nice—

τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἰθὺ κρατεῖτω.

This is the basis of operation in their common opposition to the vagaries of individualism which have their root in the declaration of the 'rights of men.'

In the introduction to *La Réforme Sociale*, Le Play summarizes in two words the ideas of the Revolution—*l'antagonisme et l'instabilité*. They express the disorganization of society and the instability of government as the result of that sceptical creed which leaves every question to be solved by the individual reason, and rejects authority as incompatible with absolute freedom. To remove these evils, threatening social dissolution, both Le Play and his friends invoke the aid of religion to reform social morals and to give force and fervour to any future attempt of social reconstruction on Christian foundations. The demand made in Le Play's programme on the virtuous self-restraint and self-sacrifice of all classes requires a lofty sense of obligation which the Christian religion alone can supply. The power of self-control and self-effacement which he expects both in employer and employed comes from a strongly-developed sense of duty. Hence the importance of displacing the doctrinaire system of the sceptical philosophers by the 'doctrine sociale,' resting on Catholic faith for its foundation.

The Comte de Mun is a warm admirer of Le Play, whom he regards as his master, but he goes far beyond him in his demands of 'absolute obedience to the principles of the Catholic Church and the infallible teaching of the Sovereign

Pontiff.'¹ When Le Play began his social studies, devout men in France were beguiled by a fair vision of 'la Belle Union de l'Eglise et de la Liberté.' But the liberalizing tendency in the Gallican Church, which men like Lamennais and Montalembert regarded as the vernal breath of a Catholic revival, has disappeared with the generation of those noble-minded and gifted Churchmen which rendered it famous. Nowadays, when statesmen once more are seized by 'la passion irreligieuse,' pronouncing it to be impossible to reconcile the Church with the Republic, because, in Gambetta's phrase, 'le cléricalisme c'est l'ennemi,' a large number of Catholics, especially among the young men of noble families in France, turn away with horror from the men of the Revolution, and Le Comte de Mun is their spokesman in the Chamber of Deputies. He is also the leader of Christian Socialists, acting as the general secretary of the 'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers,' an association whose principles are avowedly based on the social doctrine of the Encyclical and Syllabus of 1864.²

¹ See *Programme de l'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers*, of which the following is an extract:—'Opposer à la "déclaration des droits de l'homme," qui a servi de base à la Révolution, la proclamation des *Droits de Dieu*, qui doit être le fondement de la Contre-Révolution, et dont l'ignorance ou l'oubli est la véritable cause du mal qui conduit la société moderne à sa ruine; rechercher, dans une obéissance absolue aux principes de l'Eglise catholique et à l'infaillible enseignement du Souverain Pontife, toutes les conséquences qui déroulent naturellement dans l'ordre social du plein exercice de ce droit de Dieu sur les sociétés; propager par un public et infatigable apostolat la doctrine ainsi établie; former des hommes déterminés à en faire la règle de leur vie publique aussi bien que de leur vie privée; et en montrer l'application dans l'Œuvre elle-même par le dévouement de la classe dirigeante à la classe populaire; travailler ainsi sans relâche à faire pénétrer dans les mœurs ces principes et ces doctrines, et à créer une force organisée capable de les faire triompher, afin qu'ils puissent trouver leur expression dans les lois et dans les institutions de la nation: tels doivent être l'esprit et le but de notre Association, pour qu'elle réponde au programme qu'elle s'est elle-même tracé dès son origine, quand elle a, par "*l'Appel aux hommes de bonne volonté*, du 25 décembre 1871," hautement déclaré la guerre à la Révolution.'

² The 'Œuvre,' as it is briefly called, is only part of a great missionary effort of the French Church among the working classes. The 'Assemblée générale des Comités Catholiques' and the 'Congrès de l'Union des œuvres ouvrières' are connected with it, and their relationship to each other with a view to reach all sections of society is thus defined:—'Les Comités Catholiques prétendent assainir les sommets, l'Union des œuvres ouvrières affermit les bases, l'œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'ouvriers relie la base au sommet et le sommet à la base.' See, for interesting details, C. Périn, *Les Doctrines Economiques depuis un Siècle*, ch. xiv.; also cf. the recently published *Instruction sur l'Œuvre*, which contains a full account of the programme and the regulations of the society. It

The 'Œuvre' was founded by a group of French officers soon after the extinction of the Commune, for the purpose of organizing the labourers on Christian principles, and it admits a limited and select number of them to its board of administration. It aims at establishing a number of 'Cercles' and Catholic associations for the masters and the men all over France, for the purpose of ultimately fusing the two into *Corporations Chrésiennes*. The direction is placed in the hands of local committees in close connection with the central committee in Paris. It is an attempt, moreover, of bringing together 'la classe dirigeante' with 'la classe ouvrière,' and by means of Christian sympathy to bring about corporate union. The 'Cercles' combine the advantages of a religious club, a co-operative supply association, a mutual assurance society, and a labourer's friend society all in one. Eventually the 'Œuvre' purposes to become the nucleus of a number of benevolent institutions to promote the welfare of the working man. Originally intended for the workmen of large towns, the associations have spread into the villages, and are now what the Comte de Mun calls calmly settled 'islets in the midst of immense populations agitated by the tempests of social war.' There were 450 of these Cercles in 1880; and several employers of labour, like the Christian philanthropist Harmel in the Val-des-Bois, are able to give most satisfactory reports of their own attempts to transform unruly colonies of workmen into quiet and industrious communities by the adoption of the principles of the Cercles,¹ and thus to establish a happy relationship between employer and employed.

The members of the Cercles make no secret of their intentions. Their professed object is 'La contre-Révolution faite au nom du Syllabus et la grande entreprise du rétablissement de l'ordre chrétien dans le monde du travail.' One of its leading spirits is le Comte de Bréda, whose 'Economie Politique dans ses rapports avec la Loi Morale,' and other articles in the organ of the party, *l'Association Catholique*, edited by le Comte de Ségur-Lamoignon, form an important contribution to the literature of Christian Socialism in France.²

is published at the office of the 'Œuvre,' 262 Boulevard St. Germain, Paris.

¹ See Paul Ribot, *Du rôle social des Idées Chrétiennes*, vol. i. pp. 445 et seq.; also Léon Harmel, *Manuel de la Corporation Chrétienne*; *Compte rendu de l'Assemblée générale des Cercles Catholiques*, 1876; and other works mentioned by Ribot, *loc. cit.* p. 446 note.

² As one of the results of the 'Œuvre' may be mentioned the formation of an association of employers of labour, containing some of the

It may be asked what has been the practical outcome of their efforts; and some of our readers might be inclined to wonder at the absence of any mention of this movement in the deliberations of the late Congress of Trades Unionists in Paris. To this we reply that the efforts of the 'Œuvre' have scarcely yet reached the bulk of the working classes, who regard with suspicion any philanthropic effort under clerical influence. The chief merit of the 'Œuvre' consists in having awakened interest among the higher classes in the social question, and in having directed Christian zeal for the amelioration of the labourers' condition.

Without pronouncing judgment on the merits or demerits of these two systems, we cannot withhold from Le Play the just encomium bestowed on him by some of the most prominent economists of the day, such as Schäffle and Roscher, who speak of him as a most faithful investigator of facts, and a most judicious advocate of morals and religion as factors of social life; nor can it be denied that the emphatic accentuation of the mediatorial office of the Church, on the part of Ultramontane Christian Socialists, as well as their vindication of the 'caritative principle' in social economics, deserve all praise, and contain important truths, though they are met in company with ecclesiastical pretensions which weaken the force and hinder a more ready acceptance among Catholic laymen of the nineteenth century.

Belgium, with its flourishing industry and progressive national development, unaccompanied, however, by a corresponding improvement in the condition of its working population, presents a fair field for trying experimentally those principles of Christian Socialism we have just described. Here Roman Catholicism is the dominant religion, and one-half of the population (the Flemish) is perfectly amenable to Church authority. Many of the large employers of labour are friendly disposed towards the clergy, which facilitates the introduction of the 'patronat libre' recommended by Le Play. The most prosperous and intelligent among the manufacturers in the North of France, who make it their duty to fight Socialism on the lines of the 'Œuvre,' and to re-establish a friendly relationship between the men and the masters. See a most interesting "Déclaration" votée dans une assemblée d'industriels chrétiens de la région du nord, appended to Périn's *Le Socialisme Chrétien*, pp. 69 *et seq.* In *Questions Sociales et Ouvrières*, a work recently published by the 'Conseil des Etudes' of the 'Œuvre des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers,' we have the first attempt of a systematized study of the 'Régime du Travail' authorized by the Catholic Church. Also the report of the annual meeting, 'Assemblée Générale de 1883,' is full of interesting matter showing the usefulness of the 'Cercles' generally.

Play.
Belgi
terna
reform
strong
liorati
to do
is m
eccles
the e
taking
energ
all C
many
bisho
its de
Bolla
H
Belgi
better
arena
of Ch
in Be
the in
define
partie
versia
stater
Emile
tane a
perfec
Social
econo
author
well k
pamp
upon
Glads
Périn,
writer
work
lished
to be.
in the
having

Play and his followers. As a neutral State, moreover, Belgium is comparatively free from those internal and external disturbances which form a serious impediment to social reforms in France. Here, too, the clerical party are quite strong enough to carry any legislative measure for ameliorating the condition of the labouring people, if inclined to do so. If little has been done as yet in this direction, it is mainly owing to the cautious reserve of the leading ecclesiastics, who prefer to use their personal influence with the employers of labour to the perils and inconveniences of taking a leading part in social politics. But the utmost energy has been displayed in the formation of a federation of all Catholic associations of workmen which has existed for many years under the patronage of the Episcopate, the Archbishop of Mechlin, just deceased, taking a lively interest in its development from the first. One of the fathers of the Bollandist Convent in Brussels is its present director.

However, the success of the Christian Socialist party in Belgium lies rather in the field of literature. It has thriven better in the studious shades of the Academy than in the arena of social and political warfare. Nowhere has the theory of Christian Socialism been brought to higher perfection than in Belgium, probably because here, as nowhere else, under the influence of free discussion, and in view of the sharply defined contrast of opinions between the two evenly balanced parties of Clericals and Liberals, the exigencies of controversial warfare have rendered both clearness and caution in statement indispensable. In the works of Charles Périn and Emile de Laveleye, written respectively from the Ultramontane and Liberal Catholic standpoint, we have, if not the most perfect schemes, at least the most enlarged views of Christian Socialism in relation to the most recent speculations of economic science and social philosophy. M. de Laveleye, the author of the celebrated work on *Primitive Property*, is too well known in this country to require any introduction. His pamphlet on *Protestantism and Catholicism in their bearing upon the Liberty and Prosperity of Nations*, translated by Mr. Gladstone, is probably known to most readers of this Review. Périn, though highly respected on the Continent as a religious writer on economic science, and especially as the author of a work entitled *De la richesse dans les sociétés chrétiennes*, published in 1861, is a less familiar name here than he deserves to be. He occupied the chair of Political Economy and Law in the Catholic University of Louvain for thirty-seven years, having retired in 1881; and his work on the *Laws of Christian*

Society is prefaced by a Pontifical Brief, dated February. 1, 1875, full of unqualified praise from the head of his Church.

Two works have since appeared from his pen on the subject now under consideration—*Le Socialisme Chrétien*, in 1879, and *Les Doctrines Economiques depuis un Siècle*, published in 1880, which contains in its closing chapters a most interesting account of the various Catholic associations for the good of the working classes in France and Belgium. Another work (which is placed at the head of this article) contains the author's views on subjects of social interest which have occupied the attention of the world for the last twenty years. It contains, among other republished essays, three discourses delivered at the opening of the Congrès des Directeurs des Associations ouvrières Catholiques, held at Malines, Chartres, and Lille in 1863, 1878, and 1881 respectively; also an article in *La Réaction*, written in 1882; which are interesting as marking the gradual development of the Catholic doctrine of labour from the beginning of the modern Socialist movement to the present day.

Périn, too, founds social order on Divine authority, but he trusts to the moral influence of the Church rather than mechanical obedience to her laws as pronounced *ex cathedra*.

'We are at present agreed among ourselves to proclaim the rule of Christian liberty as the law of economics, a liberty equally remote from the extremes of licence and absolutism, from the *laissez-faire* system, which is the boast of Liberals, and State control over life and property, which, in one form or another, Socialism proclaims to be just and necessary.'

Périn allows that, in exceptional cases, repressive measures by the State are necessary;¹ but under ordinary circumstances, he thinks, the preventive measures proposed by Christian Socialism in its endeavours to revive the moral force of self-restraint and self-denial will prove sufficient. He acknowledges the impossibility of returning to mediæval forms of corporate union, but strongly recommends the revival of that principle of Christian love which inspired them. But, he adds cautiously, in the present day the mutual relationship

¹ Though formerly one of the most influential friends of the 'Euvre,' Périn has of late joined issue with some of its promoters who, in their endeavour to resuscitate the corporations of the Middle Ages, show a strong tendency towards State help in authorizing the formation of modern trade guilds. At the general assembly of the Catholiques du Nord et du Pas-de-Calais a resolution was passed to counteract this tendency towards State socialism, and recommending legislation in favour of free co-operation between employers and employed, under the patronage of the capitalists.

between masters and men, founded on the Christian idea of solidarity, must be at once paternal and fraternal; so that whilst maintaining the patriarchal authority of the employer, this may not interfere with the equal rights of the employed. However, 'sans la charité, rien ne se fera pour la solution du problème social.'

Individualism, according to Périn, is the principal source of our social evils, and association the only remedy. By association he does not mean, however, the collectivism of the Socialists. 'L'association telle que les Catholiques la conçoivent, bien loin d'être égalitaire, est essentiellement hiérarchique.'

The work of restoring confidence and goodwill in the mutual intercourse between masters and men must be commenced by the masters, whose unbridled cupidity in times past has produced the existing disorder; whilst their profane self-indulgence has, by the force of bad example, led to the moral degeneracy of their subordinates. If the individualism, nursed by the revolutionary spirit, acts as a dangerous solvent in society, it must be freed from its noxious imperfections; but it cannot be displaced entirely now by a 'Corporation Chrétienne.' The task he assigns to Catholics is expressed in the following words:—

'To restore the Christian association in the labour world, as being in its nature free; and to render Socialism superfluous, as in its nature unfree; to develop and strengthen by means of association all those Christian virtues which Socialism either outrages or tries to represent as vices; to give to labour, by means of these virtues, that constancy and well-proportioned strength which is able to produce true and solid wealth; to re-establish equitable dealing in the relations of labourers of every rank by a simultaneous action of justice and charity; to bring about a closer relationship and mutual attachment among members of the association, governed as they are by the law of liberty and attracted to each other by the law of charity . . . to produce everywhere union and mutual benevolence; whereas Socialism, on the contrary, sows discord and rivalry in every direction.'¹

In short, we have here, in Périn's system, what Frenchmen might call a *Socialisme Chrétien épuré*, a system which rests, indeed, on the foundation of the Catholic doctrine of assent, which is identified with assent to the Christian principles of justice, truth, and love as adapted to the special needs of our own age.

M. de Laveleye has no sympathy with what Périn calls

¹ C. Périn, *Doctrines Economiques*, pp. 225, 226.

the hierarchical system of society; nor is he, like him, an advocate of *une sérieuse et salutaire réaction*. He is opposed alike to Ultramontanist pretensions and to the antichristian spirit of those Liberals who, in their dislike of clericalism, forget the importance of religion as a social force. His position is that of a Christian philosopher *pur et simple*. As such he reminds readers of the New Testament that Christianity is the 'good news' to the poor, the promise of a kingdom in which the humble shall be exalted, and the disinherited shall possess the earth. 'We are beginning,' he says, 'to see signs from time to time, as well among the upper as the labouring classes, that the equalitarian ideas of the Gospel will one day leaven our laws and institutions.' In his work on *Contemporary Socialism*, of which a new edition has just made its appearance, he shows that Christianity does not directly propose any particular plan of social reorganization, as its precepts are rather directed to the moral change of the individual; but, he adds, it must be confessed that the movement for social emancipation among the lower orders takes its rise in the claims of equality for all, established in the Gospel of Christ, and that all attempts to ameliorate the condition of the people owe their inspiration to its teaching.

As a Liberal Catholic—perhaps more Liberal than Catholic—M. de Laveleye shows how in discarding the religion of Christ because of the supposed alliance between the Church and the ruling classes, the masses are turning their back on their natural protectors. For in a scientific age which hands them over to those cruel laws of nature according to which the strong prevail over the weak in the struggle for existence, Christian love is needed to take up the cause of the helpless. The Darwinian theory of the survival of the fittest, he acutely observes, is on the side of inequality, whereas the spirit of equity in the Christian Church has at all times striven to restore the patrimony of the poor.

In these speculations of C. Périn and M. de Laveleye we have reached the last stage in the contemporary development of Christian Socialism in France and Belgium.

It is time now to turn to the country where Socialism has of late assumed the most formidable proportions, and where the efforts of Christian Socialists in connection with the main current of the movement are, therefore, of more than ordinary interest.

The essential difference between Christian Socialism in France and in Germany consists in this, that in the former country its efforts are directed mainly against the principles

and
it en
future

T
menti
move
bodie
differ
poses
claim
whole
carrie

A
confl
signs

U
at th
indus
the C
of th
social
the u
streng
societ
who
tiani
leade
ciple
late
the h
action

C
Chris
affini
coun
Kath
fesso
relati
Cath
Prote
Chris
the r
such
most
many

and results of a past revolution, whereas in the latter it endeavours to avert the impending revolution of the future.

There are peculiar local circumstances which must be mentioned before we proceed further in our account of the movement. One of these is the existence of two Church bodies, separated from each other by doctrinal and other differences which preclude joint action for all practical purposes. The Christian Socialists in England and France claim to be representatives of the National Church as a whole; in Germany the social mission of the Church has to be carried on by Catholics and Protestants separately.

Another peculiar difficulty in Germany has been the conflict between Church and State, now happily showing signs of abatement, the so-called *Culturkampf*.

Unhappily for social reform, the *Culturkampf* broke out at the very moment when circumstances and events in the industrial life of the nation required perfect union between the Government and the Roman hierarchy. But in the heat of this conflict men on either side, equally anxious to restore social harmony in the nation, instead of asking themselves the urgent question, *what* was to be done, wasted their strength in debating *who* was to do it, and *how*. Was society to be saved by an Imperial and imperious dictator, who regarded State Socialism as a form of 'practical Christianity,' or by the sole instrumentality of that Church whose leaders boldly extended to society the time-honoured principle of Catholicism, 'Extra ecclesiam nulla salus'? The late *rapprochement* between Varzin and the Vatican holds out the hope of speedy removal of this impediment to common action in matters of social interest.

One more peculiarity in the surrounding circumstances of Christian Socialism in Germany is its relationship of natural affinity to the rising school of political economy in that country. This is aptly expressed in the alliterative phrase, *Kathedern- und Kanzelsocialisten* (i.e. Socialists of the professor's chair and the pulpit), and is illustrated by the friendly relations between the late Professor Adolf Held and the Old Catholics, and latterly between Professor Wagner and the Protestant Christian Socialists of Berlin. In England the Christian Socialists of 1848 were diametrically opposed to the ruling school of political economy of that day: there is no such antagonism between the Christian Socialists and the most eminent representative of political economy in Germany now. Both agree in seeing a close connexion between

ethics and economics. Both are opposed to the purely Malthusian theory of the *laissez-faire* school, which leaves to 'natural laws' the rectification of social disharmonies. Both bring into prominence the principle of charity, by way of correcting human egotism, which the would-be followers of Adam Smith continue to regard as the prime, if not sole, motor of all economic activity.

Such are the helps and hindrances which have to be taken into account in describing the progress of Christian Socialism in Germany; but our limited space does not allow us to enter as fully as we could wish into the theory of Christian Socialism as first propounded by Bishop Ketteler, the 'Christian Lassalle,' and further developed since, without, however, adding much to the original programme. Ketteler accepts the negative criticism of Socialists on the present condition of society. He is indignant at the disastrous results of the Liberal *régime*, as far as it affects industry, both in 'pulverizing society' into atoms of helpless individuals, and in establishing the 'brazen law of wages,' which prevents the labourer from rising in the social scale, but, on the contrary, degrades him into a mere living commodity to be disposed of in the labour market. Ketteler looks to Christianity for a restitution of the rights of men, and deliverance from this modern form of slavery, as Christ in His Gospel restored to the slaves of the Roman Empire their personal dignity as partakers of the common salvation with freemen.

In discussing the subject of property, the Bishop of Mainz, far from joining the usual attacks against acquired and inherited wealth because of the abuses to which the system is liable, acknowledges nevertheless that in one sense at least Proudhon's famous definition, 'Property is theft!' contains 'a terrible verity.'

'The Catholic Church is opposed both to the false doctrine of Communism as well as the erroneous idea of man's absolute right to do what he likes with his own, which gives a handle to Communism in its attacks on private property. The Church regards the owner of property as a steward under God, responsible to Him for the right use of it. She recognizes what is true in both, and rejects in her teaching what is false in either. She recognizes in man no absolute right of property over the fruits of the earth, as a general principle, but only the right of usufruct according to God's appointed order. She then protects the rights of property in maintaining that for the purposes of providing and controlling, in the interests of peace and order, the division of property, as developed among mankind, has to be recognized; but she also sanctifies Communism in turning the uses of property into a common benefit for all.'

In
ration
in his
we h
the r
plaine
streng
in it
ings
with

'C
prover
of mar
will o
in the

St
two g
of lab

O
ideas.
in 18
progr
protec
tion o
of tax
of cap
specu
Neith
nor it
do wi
power

In
Düsse
ing th
passed

'T
its con
also, a
its sol
State.
heal t
have re
tions.'

1 S

In the workmen themselves he expects more from the operation of Christian principle in the heart than from changes in his external condition. In the teaching of Christ, he says, we have the reasonableness of work set forth, and some of the mysterious contradictions in the world of labour explained. Christianity gives the consciousness of moral strength which dignifies labour, and inspires those engaged in it with a higher idea of their destiny; it inspires the feelings of self-reverence and self-regard, and reconciles man with his lot. In short, he concludes,

'Christianity alone provides the means for the permanent improvement of the workman's position; and without her aid, in spite of manifold efforts to this effect, the condition of the working classes will only grow worse, and approach more to that of the workers in the heathen world.'

Such are the main outlines of Ketteler's opinions on the two great questions of the day—property and the 'progress of labour,' with the many side issues raised by them.

Others have endeavoured since to develop more fully his ideas. Thus Canon Moufang, in an electoral speech delivered in 1871, sums up his demands as comprehending the social programme of the Catholic Church, thus:—1. Legislative protection of the rights of labour; 2. State aid in the formation of co-operative associations; 3. Reduction of the burdens of taxation and military service; 4. Restriction of the power of capital and the removing of evils connected with usury and speculation. This position has since been abandoned. Neither the recognized organs of the Catholic Socialist party, nor its representatives in Parliament, will have anything to do with a programme which invests the State with so much power.

In the General Assembly of Catholics in Germany held in Düsseldorf last September, the following resolution, indicating the present position of the Church on this question, was passed, on the motion of Prince Karl von Löwenstein:—

'The General Assembly of German Catholics desires to express its conviction that the social question is not only an economic, but also, and in the first place, a moral and religious one, and therefore its solution is impossible without the united action of Church and State. It regards it, therefore, as essentially necessary, in order to heal the present social evils, for the Church and her institutions to have restored to them full liberty for the exercise of their social functions.'¹

¹ See *Christl.-sociale Blätter*, 16. Jahrgang, 19. Heft, p. 606 and sq.

This is the standpoint defended with much ability in the *Christlich-soziale Blätter* and the *Historisch-politische Blätter für das katholische Deutschland*, the two most powerful organs of the Roman Catholic Church in Germany. It has found advocates, too, in that trio of eminent apologists of the Christian element in the development of society—Hitze, Albertus, and Ratzinger, writing from the standpoint of Church politics, history, and political economy, respectively. Separate and exhaustive treatment would lead us too far. But the work of Ratzinger, in his treatise on *Political Economy on Moral Principles*, deserves a passing notice. Its object is to show 'that in the simple but elevated teachings of Christianity we have the basis of social and economic life.' The work itself consists of six independent essays on the following subjects:—1. Poverty and Wealth; 2. Property and Communism; 3. Capital and Labour; 4. Usury and Interest; 5. Past and Present; 6. Culture and Civilization. It professes to be a criticism on false assumptions of the egotistic doctrines of modern political economy, and on the materialistic tendency of modern culture to which it ascribes all our social maladies. Throughout, from the first page of the introduction to the last in the concluding chapter, the author endeavours to show how a purely materialistic view of the universe—which makes the 'struggle for existence' the ultimate law of life—is opposed to the Christian law of love; and that, in the existing anarchical state of society, the harmonizing power of Christianity alone can reconcile and finally remove the antagonisms created by the competitive process of industrial enterprise.

'The doctrine of Christianity ought to govern the ideals and feelings of nations, so that society may acquire the moral energy and power to overcome the dangers of wealth and poverty, immoral luxury and degrading misery, and find in Christian love the lasting bond of union and reconciliation . . . in Christian love, liberty, and labour combined, lies the programme of social reform and the possibility of further progress in culture and civilization.'¹

The main strength of 'Catholic Socialism' lies in its widely spread system of organization. The number of associations of operatives under Church auspices, surpasses the aggregate amount of all other similar associations taken together.

¹ Ratzinger, *Die Volkswirtschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen*, pp. 515-16; also cf. *ib.* p. 206, on the influence of Christ's love and liberty in opposing the egotistic tendencies of human nature; p. 434, on the connexion between ethics and economics; p. 497-8, on the harmonizing and unifying power of Christianity.

There are in Germany Catholic associations of masters and apprentices, of factory labourers, miners, and vintners, there are 'Patriotic Bavarian' and Westphalian unions of peasant proprietors, and a number of other societies of men and women in every direction, exercising a powerful influence under strict clerical supervision. The result is that in purely Catholic regions efforts of social reform made from time to time not consonant with her creeds or not in conjunction with her clergy have proved fruitless, so that in order to succeed it is essential in the first instance to secure the Catholic ecclesiastics as auxiliaries in any such undertaking.

Christian Socialism in the Protestant Church of Germany is of comparatively recent date, though efforts in the direction of social improvement among the working classes have been made, in one form or another, ever since the revolution of 1848. The unhealthy condition of social life among the operatives which that event brought to light, and of which it was a premonitory symptom, produced a profound impression on pious minds, and became the occasion of numerous efforts of Christian philanthropy. It led to the establishment of the 'Inner Mission,' which comprehends a number of benevolent institutions all over Germany, and the formation of a 'central union to promote the welfare of the working classes of Prussia,' an association endowed by the late king, and still existing, but showing little vitality, though its president is no less a person than Professor Gneist.

As the troubles of 1848 stimulated the zeal and activity of the Church in the direction of social reform, so the alarming growth of modern Socialism, which had reached an unparalleled height in 1877, gave rise to a new school of Christian Socialists, who took for their guiding principle the words of Todt, placed by him in the forefront of his work on *Radical German Socialism and Christian Society*:

'He who would understand the social question, and contribute his own share towards its solution, must come to his task with the works of political economy in his right hand, and with the scientific literature of Socialists in his left, having before him an open New Testament.'

Todt then proceeds to show the intimate relationship between these three. Political economy teaches the anatomical construction of the social body; Socialism and the New Testament treat of its physiological and psychological maladies; they contain also the pathology, and at the same time each its own system of therapeutics to restore the

social organism to perfect health. In close alliance with the Conservative or 'Royal Socialists,' who believe in the Divine right of kings to become the saviours of society, the Christian Socialists lean on the authority of the State to initiate social reforms.

'The social question exists, and it can only be solved by a strong monarchical State allied with the religious and moral factors of national existence.'¹

Socialism, according to Todt, is nothing else but an attempt to realize the social ideal, and to remove the contradictions between the ideal conception of a perfect society and that now actually existing. A more careful investigation of the social side of Christianity, he thinks, will show that both the ideal and the means for realizing it are to be found in the New Testament. Here there are frequent denunciations against egotism and anti-social self-seeking, which are the true cause of social imperfections. Here, too, we have a vindication of the principle of human solidarity, and an enforcement of the duty of fraternal love, which only can remove them.

In a separate pamphlet on the connexion between theological and social science studies, Todt recommends the introduction of a short course of political economy into the curriculum prescribed for Divinity students at the Universities in order to acquaint the future spiritual guides of the people with the first principles of sociology. This would enable them to contradict with authority the false theories propounded by Socialist agitators, who so often succeed in misleading members of their flocks, and it would enable them to take an intelligent interest in the struggles of the poor, so as to help them to bear cheerfully the evils which are inseparably connected with our imperfect forms of industry.

Soon after the publication of his work on Socialism, Todt founded a 'Central Union for Social Reform on the Principles of Religion and Constitutional Monarchy,' which for a time received considerable support among the cultured and well-to-do classes, whilst a 'Christian Social Labour Party' was established by Stöcker in Berlin, which was intended more for the masses. Todt has since retired from his leading position in the movement, on the plea that as most of the social reforms suggested by his party have now been taken in hand by the Chancellor of the Empire, its work has been accomplished and its presence is no longer required. The Labour Party in Berlin has changed its name, which was sup-

¹ Motto of the *Staatssozialist*, former organ of the party.

posed
partic
for C
the a
For t
the p

' PRO

i. 7
Christi
ii.
unpatr
iii.
way fo
the nat
iv.
bring a

I. 7
through
with th
2. 7
3. 7
widows
4. A
rights
employers
5. F
which t
6. S

I. F
married
2. N
trade co
3. E
labour
of nation
4. P
tion of
5. R

Indu
carried
extende
point of

I. P
existing
VOL.

posed to be too expressive of partizanship in favour of a particular class, and is now called the 'Central Association for Christian Reform,' and it has been lately strengthened by the accession of Professor Wagner as one of its presidents. For those who take a special interest in the subject we place the programme of the party in full below.¹

¹ PROGRAMME AND BYE-LAWS OF THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL PARTY.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES.

- i. The Christian Social Party takes its stand on the foundation of Christian faith, and the love of king and fatherland.
- ii. It rejects social democracy as impracticable, unchristian, and unpatriotic.
- iii. It aims at the peaceful organization of the labourers to pave the way for necessary practical reforms in conjunction with other factors of the national life.
- iv. Its object is to lessen the distance between rich and poor, and bring about greater economic security.

SPECIAL DEMANDS.

I. STATE HELP.

A. Organization of the Labourers.

1. The constitution of obligatory corporate unions of different trades throughout the empire, and the regulation of apprenticeship connected with these.
2. The appointment of compulsory arbitration courts.
3. The establishment of compulsory savings banks to provide for widows, orphans, and the infirmities of old age.
4. Authorization of the unions of trades thus formed to represent the rights and interests of the labourers in their relationship with the employers.
5. Responsibility of the unions for the proper discharge of contracts which their labourers have engaged to perform.
6. State control over the financial affairs of the unions.

B. Protection of Labourers.

1. Prohibition of Sunday labour, abolition of work by children and married women in factories.
2. Normal day of labour to be modified according to the different trade corporations.
3. Energetic efforts to make these regulations for the protection of labour international, and until this has been effected sufficient protection of national labour.
4. Protection of the labouring population against the unhealthy condition of the workshop and the home.
5. Restoration of the usury laws.

C. State Industry.

Industry connected with imperial or communal employment to be carried on in a friendly spirit towards the labourers, and to be further extended when it may be found desirable from a technical and economic point of view.

D. Taxation.

1. Progressive income tax, as counterbalancing in an equitable manner existing or future indirect taxation.

The numerical strength of the party may be estimated at about 7,000 members. It prides itself on having converted Prince Bismarck to a policy of social reform; but Socialists, as a body, regard the movement with mingled feelings of suspicion and contempt. From the very first, and at the very moment when the Socialist Most engaged with Stöcker in several public discussions on Socialism and the social question under the auspices of the newly formed 'Labour Party,' the followers of Most met the efforts of what they called '*Mucker-Socialismus*' (Pietist Socialism) by the famous '*Massenaustritt*,' or public disavowal of Church membership. In other words, the efforts of the clerical party, professing 'State Socialism,' were met by a counter-movement of the anarchical Socialists, who reject with scorn this latest offer of reconciliation with society under the patronage of a 'God-fearing monarchy.'

It has been remarked on this head, as a notable fact, that the Protestant Church has never been a great social force in the land of Luther, though the agrarian Socialism of the times formed a most important element in the Reformation of the sixteenth century. And it is a remarkable fact that, in its external aspect as an ecclesiastical organization, the Protestant Church of Germany has exercised little social influence as compared with the Romish Church.

There are several reasons for this. The Protestant Church appeals to the reason and judgment rather than the dutiful obedience of her people. Hence she has no command over the masses to affect the balance of political parties, so as to

2. Progressive succession duties in the case of larger incomes and remoter degrees of affinity.

3. Taxes on Stock Exchange transactions.

4. High duties to be imposed on luxuries.

II. DUTIES OF THE CLERGY.

Affectionate and active participation in every effort directed towards the raising of the material and mental well-being of the people, as well as their moral and religious elevation.

III. DUTIES OF THE WELL-TO-DO CLASSES.

A ready advance to meet the justifiable demands of the poor, mainly by means of influencing legislation in favour of raising wages and shortening the hours of labour when it is possible.

IV. SELF-HELP.

A. Cheerful support of the unions organized by way of restoring what was good and useful in the guild corporations.

B. High sense of honour, personal and professional; the elimination of coarseness from amusements, and the cultivation of family life in a Christian spirit.

bring
by a
opinio
in the
clamor
the da
author
sentim
has be
attem
harmo

La
the ov
secular
influen
charac
subserv
the 'co
Pfaffen
eviden
tance
the Ch
whom

He
Christi
tended
a circu
the Sc
to the
whilst
added
tails, n
movem

In
say tha
scribed
frequ
duty to
to cons
amelior
speak o
these e
at least
of dem
Christi

bring social pressure to bear on the legislation of the country by a contrary vote. Again, the proneness to dissidency of opinion among her members forms an element of weakness in the social influence of the Protestant Church. In the clamour of dissonant voices discussing the flaming questions of the day, the Church ought to be able to speak with the calm authority of a body conscious of its strength in the union of sentiment and undivided effort. In the absence of these, there has been hitherto nothing else but failure in the various attempts of the Protestant Church to reconcile social disharmonies in 'the typical country of class antagonisms.'

Last of all, as throughout the whole course of its history the over-readiness of Protestantism to lean on the arm of secular authority has proportionately diminished its spiritual influence, so, too, it has been unfortunately the peculiar characteristic of the Protestant clergy in Germany to be subservient to the governing classes and domineering towards the 'common people.' Hence the synthesis of '*Junker und Pfaffen*' (squires and parsons), in popular phraseology, as an evidence of this tendency in the past. Hence, too, the reluctance of the people now to accept the mediatorial office of the Church as the arbitrator between themselves and those whom they have learned to consider the Church's patrons.

Here we close our review on the various phases of Christian Socialism on the Continent. We might have extended our researches to Austria in the East, and then, by a circular if not circuitous tour, we might have travelled to the Scandinavian North, and thence back, through Holland, to the south-west of Europe, whence we started. But this, whilst taxing the patience of the reader, would not have added much to his information except some interesting details, not materially affecting the general estimate of the movement here under consideration.

In bringing these remarks to a close, it is not too much to say that the efforts of Christian Socialism which we have described in this paper are an answer to the false aspersions so frequently cast upon the Church, of persistently neglecting her duty towards God's poor, and her unwillingness, or incapacity, to consider the claims of the working classes with a view to ameliorate their social condition. It would be premature to speak of any direct results, but there can be no doubt that these efforts on the part of Christian Socialists have tended at least to indicate points of contact, and to lay down lines of demarcation, in the mutual relationship of Socialism and Christianity, which will prove of invaluable service to all those

who believe in the mission of Christianity to reform and regenerate society.

In this, it appears to us, consists the chief merit of Christian Socialism. Its own history, as well as that of all great social movements, has shown that such points of contact do exist, and on this all reflecting men are pretty well agreed. Religion is a great social force in moving the human heart in its deepest depths, and, as such, capable of inspiring the 'enthusiasm of humanity,' which is the very soul of all social reforms. Religion also becomes a controlling power in correcting and moderating the course of such movements inspired by enthusiasm, and therefore liable to erroneous excesses unless kept in check by a higher regulating power. Again, religion is the binding force which alone is able to prevent the threatened disintegration of our modern society. Our present forms of industry produce a heterogeneity of interests which result in a conflict of classes. The hope of society lies in the unifying power of the religion of Him who said, 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, *will draw all men unto Me.*'

If there are, then, points of contact between Socialism and Christianity, implied in the very term Christian Socialism, there are also essential differences which a careful study of the subject brings to light. Christianity endeavours to work from within; Socialism from without. The former would, if possible, persuade—the latter is ready to compel—man to treat his neighbour as himself. Religion would make the love of Christ the spring of human effort; Socialism makes the force of central authority the lever of social action. Religion aims at building up the social edifice on the model of the Christian household; Socialism is destructive in its tendencies and efforts to organize society on the principle of Rousseau's social contract. Religion aims at improving first the individual, and thus eventually hoping to purify society; Socialism, on the contrary, demands radical changes in society to increase the sum of happiness in each individual. Socialism requires the use of the legal strait-jacket to enforce comparative equality; religion prefers the constraining influence of Christ to draw together the members of the Christian brotherhood.

To put it briefly, the contrast between the theories and methods adopted by Socialism and Christianity may be thus stated: The former applies force externally, the latter internally; the former works by mechanical means, the latter by means of spiritual dynamics; the former is destructive, the

latte
reform
the vo
blisin
diverg
all-im
find r
thoug
intent
Social
watch
unfair
and th
religio
is too
ance
reform
this w
establi
on the
ment
distrus
mutua
future
thinker
higher
in the
the fut
the se
indirect
all clas
antago
putting
and la
obstac
world.

latter constructive; the former is revolutionary, the latter is reformatory; the former adopts the authoritative, the latter the voluntary, principle of action in the endeavour of establishing a perfect commonwealth. Where principles are thus divergent, and the practical methods of dealing with an all-important question differ so widely, we cannot expect to find much sympathy or look for much co-operative effort, though there may be common objects in view. Hence, to all intents and purposes, we see religious philanthropists and Socialist reformers in a chronic state of practical antagonism, watching one another with suspicion, and often resorting to unfair mutual criticism. There are laudable exceptions here and there; but, generally speaking, the anti-Christian scorn of religion, expressed by Socialists so freely and so unreasonably, is too often matched by inconsiderate vehemence and intolerance on the other side. Too often efforts towards social reforms are denounced as revolutionary in their nature; and this want of discrimination in the would-be defenders of the established order becomes the occasion of fervid recriminations on the part of its assailants. The progress of social improvement is thus retarded by the friction of mutual dislike and distrust. Studies like the one before us are apt to soften mutual asperities, to remove misconceptions, and to prevent future misrepresentations; they tend to unite all moderate thinkers in one common effort for raising humanity to a higher level. What has been accomplished by such efforts in the past does not forbid us to look forward with hope to the future, when Christian charity shall have triumphed over the selfish propensities of mankind, when the direct and indirect influences of Christian ethics shall have permeated all classes, when the attempts of the Church to reunite the antagonistic elements of society shall have succeeded in putting an end to the internecine warfare between capital and labour which still presents one of the most formidable obstacles to the progress of true religion in the civilized world.

ART. VIII.—THE LONDON POOR.

1. *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London ; an Inquiry into the Condition of the Abject Poor.* (London, 1883.)
2. *How the Poor Live.* By GEORGE R. SIMS. (London, 1883.)

THERE is no doubt but that the *condition of the abject poor* is the subject which occupies the chief share of public attention at the present time ; neither can there be any doubt but that this is due, to a large extent, to the issue, under the auspices of the London Congregational Union, of the telling little pamphlet, the name of which stands at the head of this article. Others, it is true, have had some share in forcing the subject into notice. The Marquess of Salisbury's weighty article upon 'Labourers' and Artizans' Dwellings' has at once brought the question as to the housing of the poor within the range of practical politics ; but it may be questioned whether his powerful statement alone would have commanded that widespread attention which the pamphlet has secured amongst all classes of the community. And Mr. Sims's graphic papers on *How the Poor Live*, when published in the early part of this year week by week in an illustrated newspaper, do not appear to have attracted any considerable notice. Since, however, Mr. Sims's experiences, as detailed in his papers, evidently inspired the London Congregational Union with the idea of an 'inquiry into the condition of the abject poor,' and many of the facts and incidents adduced in the *Bitter Cry* are taken bodily from *How the Poor Live*, it is only right that his important share in bringing this subject to the front should be recognized and acknowledged.

It must not be supposed, however, that any new discoveries as to the condition of the poor have lately been made, nor that either Mr. Sims or the London Congregational Union are pioneers in the work that they have undertaken. So long ago as 1851 Mr. Henry Mayhew made a most exhaustive inquiry into the condition of the London poor, and published the results of his research in several volumes, entitled *London Labour and the London Poor*, which contain facts greater in number, and more startling in character, than any lately brought to light. Moreover, the clergy of the Church, as we hope presently to demonstrate, have long been aware of, and have for years been quietly grappling with, those evils, the

existed
only j

T
and li
revela
been,

N
in this
of he
utterly
lives l
these
and a
tion ;
of the
crowd
dition
that, a
they l
not fa
young
mixed
vice a
to dis
the sn
severe
the pr
tenem

N
points
can de
howev
are ga
another
clergy
with c
sad.
partic
of the
sad en

Th
his pa
'select
many
comm

existence of which the London Congregational Union seem only just to have realized.

To the general public, however, unfamiliar with the homes and lives of the poor, undoubtedly the *Bitter Cry* has been a revelation, and the questions suggested by its perusal have been, Can this be really true? Is there no exaggeration?

Now, the statements of the pamphlet amount to this: That in this great city there are thousands who are living the lives of heathens, who, if not actually denying God, at least are utterly indifferent to Him; thousands who never in all their lives have entered a place of worship or said a prayer; that these thousands are living herded together in narrow courts and alleys where the dwellings are not fit for human habitation; that by reason of the large rents charged, and by reason of the paucity of dwellings, whole families are compelled to crowd into single rooms in places where the unsanitary condition of the surroundings is an aggravation of their sufferings; that, as a natural consequence of the crowded state in which they live, immorality of the vilest sort abounds; marriage is not fashionable, and thousands of women and even girls as young as twelve years of age are leading lives of sin; that mixed in closest contact with those who are leading lives of vice are thousands trying to live honestly, but almost driven to dishonest courses by the difficulty of obtaining work and the smallness of the remuneration they can command for the severest toil; and lastly, that most of those who thus live are the prey of remorseless landlords who, owning these wretched tenements, fatten on exorbitant rents.

Now, although exception might be taken as to one or two points, none acquainted with the poorer districts of London can deny that this picture, in the main, is true. One caution, however, is necessary. The facts adduced in the *Bitter Cry* are gathered from a large area; one from this parish, and another from that; and probably there is hardly a London clergyman who could not readily parallel these particular facts with others, out of the book of his own experience, equally sad. It is not possible, however, to generalize from these particular instances without conceiving an exaggerated idea of the state of the London poor. Their condition is, in truth, sad enough without conceiving all to be of the blackest hue.

The writer of the *Bitter Cry* tells us, towards the end of his pamphlet, that the London Congregational Union have 'selected three of the very worst districts in London, from which many of the foregoing facts have been gathered,' in which to commence missionary operations; and later on we learn that

these three districts are Shadwell, Ratcliff, and Bermondsey ; the two former of which are in East, and the latter in South London. It may be well, therefore, briefly to glance at some facts concerning these districts ; but inasmuch as what is true concerning the one is, in the main, true concerning the other, we will confine our survey to East London, merely prefacing that East and South London conjointly contain a population of about two millions.

It will probably serve our purpose best if we take some specimen parishes and give a short description in outline of their inhabitants. Probably no parish more nearly corresponds in every detail to the picture in the *Bitter Cry* than Spitalfields, which contains a population of about 20,000. This population includes a large number of very poor but honest folks, a strong contingent of what are termed the criminal classes, and a great number of those who, unable to obtain regular employment, may at any time enter on a life of crime. These two last classes, to a great extent, find their homes in the common lodging-houses which are unusually numerous in this parish. Out of the 20,000 people in Spitalfields no less than 6,000 are inhabitants of these lodging-houses. Some of these houses accommodate from two to three hundred persons ; others contain only a few dozen people. In them may be found some of the lowest and most degraded of the criminal classes ; many who have held good positions in life, but who, through drunkenness or dishonesty, or, in rare cases, through pure misfortune, have sunk lower and lower until the common lodging-house alone has remained as a refuge. Here too may be often found young people who have come from the country to 'better themselves,' as they fancy, but, failing to obtain work, have been driven to these haunts of vice, all ignorant of their character. Quite lately in these lodging-houses were discovered three cases, which are types of classes usually to be found there in addition to the regular frequenters : (1) A young man who had come to London from Scotland, thinking himself certain of obtaining work in the great city, and who, finding starvation staring him in the face, had been forced to take refuge here. (2) A young governess, who, finding herself in a position which threatened to ruin her life, had taken refuge in the kitchen of a lodging-house for single women. (3) A man who had once held the position of a naval officer, but who was now absolutely penniless. Indeed, it is hard to say what class is unrepresented in the common lodging-house : broken-down merchants and ruined doctors and barristers, and even clergymen, have been found there.

Grea
house
that
inspe
there
one a
evils.
cover
and,
grow
possi
is liv

thing,
tincti
some
the su
with g
been
pallia
proba
tenda
preach
appall
elders

B
be fo
misfo
Years
speci
unab
are j
pittar
enter
cover
years
fortab
is use
said,
white
and l
At pr
a day
and t
exam

Great, however, as are the evils connected with these lodging-houses, two evils, elsewhere present, are here absent. Now that lodging-houses have to be registered and are under police inspection, there is in them no *excessive* overcrowding, and there is no *excessive* dirt. In the houses hard by both the one and the other are to be found, and here exist the greatest evils. Families of eight or more persons are to be easily discovered crowded into one room of about eight feet square, and, as may be imagined, the children of those who thus live grow up in such a way that innocence and modesty are impossibilities to them. As has lately been written by one who is living in the midst of such homes:—

‘Undoubtedly virtue to many of them always has been an unknown thing, a word conveying no definite idea to their minds. Of the distinction between *mine* and *thine* their view has always been that of some heathen nations, who regard purloining as one of the fine arts, the successful practice of which must always cover the perpetrators with glory. What other people regard as the grossest sins have always been to them habits which no effort was ever made to conceal or palliate. In fine, they have grown up heathen. Of God they have probably heard, either through the medium of their occasional attendances at school, or from lending a casual ear to some open-air preacher. But to them He is no reality. As a consequence of this appalling ignorance we find children anticipating the vices of their elders at ages so early that the fact appears incredible.’

Besides, however, the classes alluded to above there are to be found in Spitalfields, or hard by, many who through sheer misfortune are in the greatest straits. Here is an example. Years ago Spitalfields was the home of silk-weavers, and still specimens of this almost extinct class are to be found who, unable in old age to turn their hands to any other work, are just enabled to keep off starvation by the miserable pittance they can earn. Lately, in a room which had to be entered by a trap door, an old man and his wife were discovered who were in sore straits. Till within the last few years he had always been able to earn enough to live comfortably by weaving that particular sort of ribbed silk which is used for making clerical gowns. ‘Now, however,’ as he said, ‘that the clergy have nearly all taken to preaching in white gowns, there is very little demand for that sort of silk, and I have to turn my hand to any work that I can get. At present I am weaving satin, but if I work fourteen hours a day I can only make one and a half yards at most, and the price I am paid is 15*d.* per yard.’ Here is another example. In this neighbourhood many so-called furnished

rooms are let for which 10*d.* a night is charged, the rent being collected each morning, Sunday (which is given in as a free day) excepted. The furniture consists as a rule of a bed and scanty, though clean, bedding, a small table and two chairs. In such a room was lately found a man, his wife and three children. The man had formerly been a carman, but now was out of work through illness. He appeared more fit for bed than work. His coat, as well as the children's boots, had been pawned in order to provide food. That morning, he had been unable to pay his rent; next day probably he would be turned out. Then, by pawning more clothes, money would be raised for a few nights' rest in one of the common lodging-houses; then the whole family would be driven to the streets, where they would wander for a night or two, until at last by sheer necessity they found their way to the casual ward and workhouse. This is the history of many a family broken down by misfortune.

In many of the Bethnal Green parishes the same features, with respect to the last-named class, as those noticed above are reproduced. In the parish of S. Philip, which is about a quarter of a mile long, by an eighth in width, there are massed together about 9,000 people. Whole streets are found where each room is occupied by one family, and the population, so far as the men are concerned, appears to be engaged mainly in the unremunerative work of *looking out for a job*. The women turn their hands to such tasks as match-box making at 2½*d.* per gross, or sack-making at ½*d.* apiece. In this parish, though there is a dead level of poverty, and though the houses are as miserable as can well be imagined, there is an absence of many of the more distressing features noted above.

The parishes about S. George's Street, better known as Ratcliffe Highway, are chiefly noticeable for the presence of large numbers of prostitutes, who, however, appear to keep themselves separate from other classes, as stated in the *Bitter Cry*. Whole streets are tenanted by women of this description. But those who live on the spot are able to discriminate and to know that, whereas perhaps one street is composed of houses of ill fame, the next one is inhabited by poor but respectable costermongers. S. George's Street abounds with dancing-saloons. These saloons, which are as a rule attached to public-houses, are capable of holding from 100 to 300 persons, and, as no charge is made for admission, they are generally full. The women are of the class one might expect to find in such places, and the men chiefly sailors of

all n
self-i
atten
in su
deba
A
of th
than
of hu
and I
on.'
take
late a
P
the h
centr
Lond
cover
found
is th
Hack
lately
great
sweet
poor
N
all t
weal
spect
V
Lond
case.
lation
Eliza
as th
mean
evil a
tinua
of th
them
are n
to liv
their
must
thos

all nationalities. Although the landlords, from motives of self-interest, are careful to suppress anything likely to attract attention, yet nevertheless the scenes which may be witnessed in such places are those of almost incredible ruffianism and debauchery.

Anyone, however, who desires to get a glimpse, not only of the vicious, but of the suffering poor, cannot do better than make a journey to the docks and witness the sad scene of hundreds of men, willing to work, waiting hour after hour, and hoping against hope, in the expectation of being 'taken on.' As early sometimes as 3.30 a.m. will half-starved men take up their position at the dock gates, and sometimes as late as 2.30 p.m. they may be found still waiting.

Poverty and overcrowding, however, exist not only in the heart of London. These evils are being pushed from the centre to the circumference, and in the northern part of East London, what till lately were green fields are rapidly being covered with houses tenanted by the very same classes that are found in Bethnal Green or S. George's-in-the-East. Notably is this the case all along the banks of the River Lea. At Hackney Wick, and in the district of All Souls, Clapton, lately have sprung up whole neighbourhoods where the greatest poverty abounds. Driven from the centre by the sweeping away of courts, alleys, and narrow streets, the abject poor are finding their way to the suburbs.

Now, the question naturally arises—What is the cause of all this suffering and vice? Whence comes it that in the wealthiest city of the world there should be the saddest spectacle of misery and sin?

Without doubt the deplorable contrasts to be found in London arise in the first place from the very nature of the case. In a city of such enormous size, containing a population about equal to that of all England in the time of Queen Elizabeth, there must exist the extreme of poverty as well as that of wealth; and where all is one great rush for the means of life the weakest must ever go to the wall. And this evil arising from the largeness of the city is aggravated continually by the incursion of numbers of people, from all parts of the country, who come to London, as they all say, *to better themselves*. In these days of easy locomotion, young people are not content to stay where their fathers have been content to live and work before them, and sooner or later they find their way to London, arguing that in so large a place there must be abundance of work for all. And so the number of those in the chronic condition of looking for employment is

continually increased. Surely the country clergy and magistrates could do no better work than to warn their poorer neighbours of the true state of affairs and to deter them from seeking their fortunes in this already overcrowded city. Next, from the largeness of the city there springs another evil—the separation of classes. In this great city the rich and the poor do *not* meet together. Dives, dwelling in his pleasant mansion, knows very little of Lazarus, by whose labours he benefits, who dwells apart from him in an unknown region far away. And because of this utter separation between rich and poor there is first a want of sympathy, simply because each is unknown to the other, and then evils are allowed to exist and grow because the poor themselves are too feeble to resist them. Why is it, for instance, that in country towns the evil of unsanitary and overcrowded dwellings has not grown to the relative dimensions it has reached in London? Simply because there has been public opinion to check it. Where rich and poor are mingled together the rich are a protection to the poor, and as soon as the presence of evil makes itself known the powerful influence of the rich is exercised to put it down. Not so is it in London, where till lately the sufferings of the poor were all unknown to the majority of the rich by reason of their really dwelling in different colonies.

Next we must attribute much of the wretchedness that exists to the very efforts that have been made to alleviate it. There is no doubt but that improvements effected lately by the removal of rookeries and the widening of streets have considerably aggravated the evil of overcrowding, and by diminishing accommodation have increased the demand for it. Many of the ejected tenants of abolished slums are too poor to move far, or unable to do so by reason of their being compelled to live near their work. The dwellings erected in place of those pulled down are too highly rented for them to live in, and so they find their way to the already overcrowded courts and alleys hard by. For instance, the majority of those lately turned out of their homes by improvements in Whitechapel have found their way to the poor parishes between S. George's-in-the-East and the riverside. The largeness of the metropolis causes a further evil—the scarcity of work. There is no doubt but that there is not work enough for the *continuous* employment of those willing to work. The very haste with which all work has to be accomplished nowadays necessitates the existence of a large number of persons who lie idle for the greater part of their time in order to be ready for an emergency. For in-

stan
doc
cam
in a
unle
mar
ledg
clas
Am
fail
for
mar
pens
befo
occu
from
mot
the
to m
after
gros
and
ling
in m
ther
ther
day
was
flow
orde
I
from
prov
a litt
have
entir
in th
most
main
end
semi
denc
that
resul
of dr

stance, it is stated that whereas, formerly, vessels coming into dock were content to wait sometimes for days till their turn came round for unloading, so great is now the competition in all trade that the moment a vessel is in dock she has to be unloaded, so that at one time thousands of hands are in demand, and at another comparatively few. The very knowledge of the possibility of this sudden demand has created a class of expectant loafers always waiting for the odd chance. Amongst the causes of the sufferings of the poor we must not fail to note the inconsiderateness of some employers. To toil for seventeen hours at a stretch in order to earn 1s. 6d., as many women do, is in itself hard enough; but it often happens that when the task is over a good deal has to be endured before the fruit is reaped. Here is a case in point of late occurrence. Mrs. X. and her daughter—a cripple, deformed from infancy—make artificial flowers for a business firm. The mother, who is more than sixty years of age, has to walk into the City, over three miles, to get her work. Very often she has to make three or four journeys before she obtains any. Lately, after making three journeys, she obtained materials for one gross of flowers. The flowers were of a troublesome pattern, and she was told the price paid for them would be four shillings. She and her daughter were occupied two whole days in making them, and the day after they were finished she took them to the warehouse, waited, standing for two hours, and then was told that she must call for payment on the following day. This she did, waited three hours, standing, and then was paid half-a-crown, and told that the market value of the flowers had deteriorated to that extent since they were ordered. Comment on such a case as this is needless.

But the sufferings of the abject poor do not arise altogether from causes without themselves. In many cases reckless improvidence accounts for subsequent misery. Very often when a little money has been earned it is spent out of hand. Cases have been known where a man and his wife have spent the entire earnings of the week on Saturday and on Sunday—he in the public-house on Saturday night, she in providing the most expensive luxuries for the Sunday dinner with what remained after her husband's debauch; and then, towards the end of the week, the family has been discovered in a state of semi-starvation. Again, as hinted above, joined with improvidence is drunkenness. Indeed, it is not an exaggeration to say that nearly all the misery of outcast London is either the direct result of, or is considerably aggravated by, this monster evil of drunkenness. The vicar of a well-known East-End parish

writes : ' Drunkenness is the crying sin of this part of London, and if it were not for that the people would be an honest, hard-working set. In many cases relief is useless when parents spend their money in drink, and any help given simply feeds the vice.' A great crime was lately committed in the neighbourhood of London, and even those persons well acquainted with poverty-stricken homes, who had occasion to enter the rooms occupied by the man who was charged with that crime, marvelled at the squalor and filth and wretchedness and seeming poverty that there they found. Yet the man confessed that he was, and had been for some time, in receipt of fifty shillings per week. Assisted by his wife, he had been accustomed to drink it all away.

We must notice yet one more cause of the increasing vice, if not the suffering, of the poor. The London poor may be roughly divided into three classes : (1) the poor who, though poor, have regular work ; these are gradually separating themselves from their less fortunate brethren, and are rapidly being provided for in the improved dwellings which are now to be found in most quarters of London, and in such suburbs as Tottenham and Battersea. (2) The criminal classes, who are to be found in the common lodging-houses and the rookeries and courts and alleys hidden behind the crust of more respectable dwellings which lines the main thoroughfares of East London. (3) Between these two extremes there is the large class of what may be termed the indigent poor, many of whom would gladly live honest, respectable lives, but who are driven to herd with those whose lives are vicious, and who therefore too often end by recruiting the criminal population. The problem to be solved is how to deal with this large class, how to create in them a higher ideal, how to help them in their struggles after better things, how to save them—and, above all, their children—from sinking down to the depths beneath them. The artizan classes may be trusted to care for themselves ; the criminal and thoroughly vicious must be dealt with as opportunity permits ; but can nothing be done to improve the condition of those who are not yet utterly lost to the ranks of honesty and respectability ?

We must confess that there seems to be no *one single remedy* for ills to which attention has been drawn ; but though we cannot find any royal road to improvement, and cannot expect that evils will vanish at once because attention has been drawn to them, yet nevertheless there are many methods—political, social, and religious—each and all of which, if rightly and energetically pursued, must contribute something towards

the
Th
is th
such
how
incr
to u
tain
hav
to in
is no
sub-
whic
lodg
num
shou
sub-
prop
such
mon
see
(2)
ritic
the
Why
that
for t
outs
rent
varie
for w
be en
they
pres
Man
woul
room
easier
set a
rate
for th
same
the p
be ta
before

the alleviation of the piteous condition of outcast London. These we proceed to specify. Recognizing that overcrowding is the source of much mischief, we may reasonably look for such legislation as will minimize this evil. Most probably, however, at first more would be accomplished by giving increased power to carry out existing regulations with respect to unsanitary dwellings than by any new enactments. Certainly the quixotic and semi-socialistic suggestions which have so freely been put forth by some of late are more likely to inaugurate new evils than to mitigate existing ones. What is needed seems to be: (1) That houses in which rooms are sub-let should be placed under the same regulations as those which have proved so beneficial in the case of common lodging-houses. As an omnibus is licensed to carry a certain number of persons only, according to its capabilities, why should not houses, below a certain rental, in which rooms are sub-let, be licensed to hold the number of people they can with propriety contain? And why should not the landlords of such houses be compelled—equally with the owners of common lodging-houses—to keep them in decent repair and to see that the necessary sanitary arrangements are provided? (2) That increased power should be granted to local authorities to demolish houses unfit for habitation, without incurring the enormous expense at present entailed by the operation. Why should, as it were, a premium be placed on property that has been neglected? (3) That facilities should be afforded for the erection of wholesome dwellings for the poor at the outskirts of the city, which could be obtained at a reasonable rental; and that pressure should be brought to bear upon the various railway companies to grant special rates of conveyance for working men. Suitable houses for the poor would speedily be erected in suburbs of London if they were in demand, and they would be in demand to a much greater extent than at present, if the cost of travelling to and fro were not so great. Many of those who are now compelled to live in London would gladly move to the outskirts, and would so make more room at the centre, if the way to do so were made a trifle easier for them. The Great Eastern Railway Company has set a good example by granting tickets to working men at the rate of one penny per journey, and by affording every facility for their transport. Why should not other companies do the same? (4) That, if the process of demolishing the houses of the poor be carried on to any great extent, some care should be taken that provision is made for those who are ejected, *before* they are turned out. In the city of Glasgow, where of

late whole neighbourhoods of unsanitary houses have been swept away, this has been managed. Why should it not be so in London?

How all this is to be best accomplished it belongs to the province of legislators and social reformers to determine. Reforms, however, on the lines indicated would seem best calculated to meet the present distress. We must not, however, fancy that such reforms alone, if carried out to ever so large an extent, would effect a cure for the present state of things. If decent houses were provided to-morrow for all classes of the community we should very soon perceive that the present evils remained. Unless the poor themselves have a loftier ideal than at present, unless they have a more earnest desire to improve their condition, unless they have a detestation of filth and indecency and immorality—unless, in a word, they have some constraining motive for seeking freedom from their present condition—all the efforts of legislators and social reformers will be of no avail. And here we must express regret that the title, the *Bitter Cry*, is not more really true with respect to the outcast poor. Alas! too often they do *not* cry out bitterly for relief; they are only too content with their present condition; they have too little desire to better it. When once a man cries out bitterly, it means that he feels a need of something better, and when once he feels the want the greatest hindrance to his improvement is removed. Is it possible to implant this desire in the hearts of the abject poor? Are there any means by which this want can be created? Here, we believe, is the province of religion. We observe that the writer of the *Bitter Cry*, after detailing the evils, social and moral, which abound, proposes as a remedy the establishment of mission halls, from which men and women may go forth to promulgate religious principles. We think that the London Congregational Union are right in believing that the only power which can really become a regenerating influence is the power of true religion. We believe that, if men once really believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and gaze upon the matchless perfection of His holy life, there will spring up in their minds a desire to be freed from those surroundings which keep them from growing in His likeness. That this is so is proved by the complaint so often made by the clergy of the very poor parishes, that so soon as they gain a convert he leaves them; directly the man is desirous of leading a Christian life, he says, 'I must get out of this. For my own sake, for my children's sake, I cannot stay.' We believe that it is the blessed office of religion to preach '*deliverance to the*

captives
but also
and pur
the des
help th
influenc
And he
Cry, wh
of Chri
and spa
good.
opening
the Cor
these so
are pre
secondl
organiz
which e
for whi
him a b
every c
spiritua

Wit
to the a
the tha
express
deed he
silence.
notice t
is being
Rochest

Now
because
Church
Church
is doing
done by
say that
London
benefice
Without
tempora
one who
that pre
because
VOL.

captives, not only by actually ministering to their necessities, but also by presenting to them a high and lofty and noble and pure ideal, which by its very beauty attracts and compels the desire to be like it, and that thus religion helps men to help themselves. The question here arises, how is this blessed influence of religion to be diffused amongst the abject poor? And here again we are at one with the author of the *Bitter Cry*, when he maintains that the effort to spread the principles of Christianity must be organized effort, and that desultory and spasmodic attempts will result in but little permanent good. At this point, however, we remark: first, that the opening of three, or any number of, mission halls under the Congregational Union will only increase the number of these solitary efforts, unless, indeed, the Congregational Union are prepared to cover the whole area of outcast London; secondly, that there does exist, in full operation, a magnificent organization, namely, the parochial system of the Church, by which every house in London is assigned to some one parish for which a clergyman is responsible, who gathers round him a band of workers, and establishes, so far as is possible, every conceivable agency for improving the material and spiritual condition of the poor.

Without desiring in any way to detract from the credit due to the author of the *Bitter Cry*, or without wishing to qualify the thanks we feel bound to accord to him, we cannot but express regret that the organization of the Church, and indeed her very existence, should have been passed over in silence. We should have thought it almost impossible for no notice to be taken of the existence of such work as that which is being effected in South London, under the Bishop of Rochester, or in East London, under the Bishop of Bedford.

Now, as many persons have read the *Bitter Cry*, and because no mention is made therein of the work of 'the Church' (though much is said of what are termed 'the Churches') they have leapt to the conclusion that the Church is doing nothing, we think it well to point out what is being done by the Church in outcast London. And first we would say that, so far as the Church is concerned, there is no *outcast* London: for she opens wide her arms to embrace within her beneficent care all, however poor and sinful they may be. Without respect to creed or nationality she ministers to the temporal wants of all, and she offers spiritual help to everyone who cares to have it. How is it, then, it may be asked, that present evils exist? The answer is a simple one. First, because, as long as the world lasts, evil will continue, and

there will be always a large number of persons, alas! who, in spite of every effort, will refuse to be reclaimed; and, secondly, because, although the Church everywhere has 'touch' of the poor and sinful, her organization wants strengthening in order that she may reach all. The framework is splendid, but in places it wants clothing with flesh. If only the parochial system of the Church were strengthened, we believe that not only would the abject poor all be reached, but that many more than at present would be influenced and saved. We believe this to be the true answer to the *Bitter Cry*. We believe that if the Church is only able to present herself in all the fulness of her parochial system she will become a power amongst the godless and indifferent to raise them as no other agency ever could hope to do. And we are glad to notice that this is the matured opinion of one so well qualified to speak on the subject as Lord Shaftesbury, who at the last annual meeting of the East London Church Fund is reported to have said:—

'You are going to bring, if you can, districts of 2,000 people under the superintendence of single clergymen. You will then at last carry into effect in our great towns that noble system which is called the parochial system. How can a clergyman with 10,000 people under his charge see to their welfare? I would reduce the number even to 1,500, because, if the clergyman is to produce the effect he is capable of producing; if he is the right man; if he can come with heart to heart, mind to mind, soul to soul, feeling to feeling, class to class, and if he can introduce what the Germans call the individualizing system—that is, teach every individual in his turn in the course of the year—then, indeed, the parochial system will be brought into full operation. Then you will see a growth of that spirit which has made this country great, and you will be able to resist infidelity, socialism, and all the assaults that can be made on this blessed old Church of the Constitution.'

We said above that the Church has 'touch' of all in London. It is even so; facts which have been revelations to the outside world have for long been matters of everyday experience to the clergy of East and South London, and the clergy have not only been aware of the facts but have been doing their best, and in a great measure successfully, to grapple with them. Let us give an instance. A sensational article lately appeared in a daily paper, in which the writer, after graphically depicting the homes he had witnessed, said he thought he had seen the worst that could be seen, but he had not yet been to a certain court. He describes what he saw there, and then tells us that he went straight home, for he could bear no

more. The clergyman of that parish read the article, and at once said, 'Oh, he must mean A and B and C.' His Scripture-reader read the article, and he said at once likewise, 'He must mean A and B and C.' They each were able at once to identify the people alluded to. And if that special correspondent had applied to them he would have learnt : first, that the three families were Irish Roman Catholics ; secondly, that the cause of the present distress in two out of the three cases was drunkenness ; thirdly, that, though Roman Catholics, they had been regularly visited ; and, fourthly, that substantial relief had been given to them. Yet the outside public probably assumed that these people of whom they read were utterly uncared for. Let us see what sort of work the Church is carrying on in East-End parishes. We will take as an instance one of the parishes selected by the London Congregational Union for their operations : namely Ratcliff, the population of which is between seven and eight thousand, of which about half are Roman Catholics. The vicar shall speak for himself :—

'I have been vicar of this parish for more than three years ; there is not a court or an alley into which I have not been myself personally ; there are few houses into which one or other of my workers has not entered, and I should say there is not a house into which, if required, I should hesitate to go alone at any time of the day or night. The people are very poor, and there are many cases which need help ; these are carefully investigated, and such help given as is required. I have as my fellow-workers, a curate, a lay assistant, a lady worker, a mission woman, and a sick nurse, besides several voluntary helpers, so that few, if any, cases of distress or sickness are unknown to us ; and relief is given without regard to sect or nationality. Besides the services in church we have a service in our mission-room, a Sunday school with over 200 children, and a class for ragged children. In connexion with Temperance work there are two large Bands of Hope and two Temperance Societies, which are adding each week to their numbers. There is a Working Men's Club, and a Working Lads' Institute for older boys, and a Working Girls' Institute for older girls, and in connexion with this latter a Home, where several ladies reside, and devote their time to work among girls and women working in the factories.'

We spoke above of Spitalfields. Let us just glance at some of the many agencies for good carried on in this parish.

1. The clergy are well known in the common lodging-houses ; they frequently hold services there, and sometimes spend the whole night engaged in rescue work. Many lads are brought out of these lodging-houses, and are lodged either in one of the two—

2. Homes for Working Boys, situate in the parish, or drafted off to other Homes outside. The Homes in the parish at present contain 80 lads; the boys stay there between the ages of 14 and 18 years, paying five shillings and sixpence a week, which includes lodging, food, washing, and medical attendance. The clergy make themselves the friends of these boys. In one Home one of the clergy attends every night to conduct prayers. The boys, as a rule, turn out well.

3. During these night excursions many girls are also rescued and drafted off to Homes. More than 100 girls are thus rescued each year, not to speak of many influenced.

4. As an evidence that the clergy are reaching the right sort of people it may be mentioned that there is a Temperance Society, numbering about 300 men, about half of whom have been at some time or other 'in trouble,' and that amongst the communicants are some who, having lived godly lives for years, formerly were criminals.

This slight glimpse at the work of these two parishes will give some idea of what is going in nearly every parish both East and South.

The Bishop of Rochester's Diocesan Fund is rapidly strengthening the parochial machinery in South London. Five thousand a year is being spent on 'living agents,' amongst whom are 19 mission clergy, 24 Scripture-readers, and 46 mission women.

The Bishop of Bedford's East London Church Fund is doing the same work for East London. At an annual cost of 9,000*l.* it supplies 129 living agents, mission clergy, curates, deaconesses, lay helpers, mission women, and parochial nurses. In the 72 parishes aided by the fund there are at work 163 clergy, 63 lay helpers, and 101 mission women. In these parishes there are 248 services held each Sunday, at which there are between forty and fifty thousand attendances. From all this it will be perceived that, whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Church in the past, she is not chargeable with apathy now.

Let us hope that the present excitement will not end in talk, but that everyone whose heart has been stirred by the *Bitter Cry* will feel it a duty to investigate first the condition of his poorer brethren, and then the work that the Church is doing in their midst, and next to ask himself in what way he best can help in the great task that lies before us. If only well-to-do parishes in town and country are led extensively to follow the noble example set by so many public schools and

colleges by affiliating to themselves poor parishes and taking a personal interest in them, no one can say what a change may not be effected. It cannot be expected, however, as we have endeavoured to show, that any exertions will immediately alter the condition of the London poor. Let politicians and social reformers by all means do their best; they can do much to 'make straight the way'; but, after all, it is to the Church, with her Divine commission, her life-giving means of grace, her great organization, that we must look if any real good is to be effected. She will do more than any other agency to bring rich and poor together; she will do more than any other organization to create amongst the abject poor a want of better things; she, as the Church of the nation, will be able most effectively to minister to the temporal wants of the sick and suffering.

ART. IX.—THE REPORT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS' COMMISSION.

Report of the Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Constitution and Working of the Ecclesiastical Courts. Vol. I. The Commission; the Report; Minutes of Proceedings; Historical Appendices. Vol. II. Minutes of Evidence, with Abstract and Analytical Subject Index; Replies from Anglican and other Churches as to Ecclesiastical Procedure therein, with Abstracts; Patents of Provincial and Diocesan Officials Principal; Returns as to Rule of Procedure in Diocesan Courts. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of her Majesty.

THE bare recitation given above will suffice to convey to those who have not already seen the Report—for it is even now difficult to obtain, though reprinted—what a bulk and complexity of matter is contained in these two large volumes. But these materials, though thus multifarious and exuberant, have been rendered singularly available by the very great pains and skill laid out upon their editing and redaction. About the Recommendations at which the Royal Commissions have arrived as the result of their long labours there will, of course, be difference of opinion and much warm discussion. About the merits of the Report as a piece of literary

work, as a conveniently arranged and complete magazine of information on its subject, there is entire unanimity. The Secretary and his colleagues, and the various committees of the Commissioners—for much of the constructive work was done by them through committees—deserve and will receive the hearty thanks of all whom duty or interest may incite to grapple with the huge subject here laid out for inspection in these Blue-books.

The Report was only given to the public when August was reaching its close. We offered in October, which was all that could be done after such cursory perusal as time permitted, a summary view—a general outline—of the Recommendations, with a few remarks on various aspects presented at first sight by the scheme here and there. But certainly our readers have a right to expect some more thorough examination of what is proposed, and some more systematic attempt to estimate its bearings and influence.

As might have been expected, attention has been turned from the first to the Final Court of Appeal. At Reading the very large and unusually influential assembly, which the summons of the Church Congress Committee convoked this year, devoted two sessions to a consideration of this important Report. But there was very little said about any portion of it except that which concerned the Final Court. Dr. Hayman fastened, with characteristic tenacity, upon this part of the Commissioners' suggestions, and gave the cue in so doing to the long succession of readers and speakers that followed. It was, however, apparent that the whole discussion, though quite inevitable, was notwithstanding somewhat premature. People had not read the Report, or, at any rate, had not had time to digest its contents, by the first week of October. Then later in the month the Diocesan Conferences came on, and nearly all of them, as was again inevitable, took this tempting subject up. It cannot be said, indeed, that the Final Court has in the dioceses swallowed up everything else, as it did at the general gathering at Reading; but certainly in them, too, the lion's share of attention has been bestowed on this one item.

The conferences which have discussed the Commission and its result have been, so far as we have observed, the following:—Bath and Wells, Carlisle, Chester, Chichester, Hereford, Lichfield, Lincoln, Liverpool, Manchester, and Truro. St. Albans was also to have applied itself to this knotty business, and to have had the valuable help of an introductory paper by Canon T. W. Perry, but this element of the agenda

was
appo
the l
of th
was
part
also
but
ultra
defe
Bath
prop
Cour
wher
they
com
its F
with
as co
been
noth
judg
abou
it is
that
'sch
Crow
Cour
repr
for t
so co
This
any
and
and
posi
clea
mor
of C
27,
mitt
on '

was excluded by pressure of other matters. Lichfield has appointed a committee, which is carefully to sift and discuss the Blue-books and to present a Report for the consideration of the conference next year. At Liverpool a hostile motion was proposed, and received the warm support of the Orange party and the extreme Church Associationists, and they derived also some help from the Bishop's observations on the Report; but they underwent, even in this corner of the Church where ultra-Low Church views have their stronghold, a decided defeat, the motion being rejected by 120 to 70. Lincoln and Bath and Wells have excepted from their general praise the proposals of the Commissioners which concern the Final Court. With these exceptions the conferences have everywhere expressed approval of the Report on the whole, though they have done so, as was fitting in an affair of such great compass, in guarded and qualified terms. The Report and its Recommendations have been launched before the Church with quite as much good-will and hopefulness on all sides as could have been expected; perhaps as much as could have been desired, for this subject is emphatically one about which nothing is more to be deprecated than perfunctory and hasty judgments.

The Commissioners introduce their Recommendations about the Final Court with a few general remarks, to which it is important that attention should be called. They declare that their

'scheme is framed on the assumption that every subject of the Crown who feels aggrieved by a decision of any such (ecclesiastical) Court has an indefeasible right to approach the Throne itself with a representation that justice has not been done him, and with a claim for the full investigation of his cause. No Ecclesiastical Court can so conclude his suit as to bar this right.'¹

This might seem to some a self-evident proposition. But anyone who will read the almost numberless letters, articles, and speeches which have already clustered round the Report and its Recommendations, will see that, if not denied, the proposition is often practically forgotten. And yet it is very clearly recognized by the 4th of the Canons of 1604; and more recently has again been affirmed by the Lower House of Convocation of Canterbury. This House, on June 26 and 27, 1879, agreed to a series of important resolutions submitted on presentation of a Report prepared by a committee on 'Relations of Church and State.' This committee sat for

¹ *Report*, vol. i. p. liii.

a period very similar to that occupied by the Royal Commission, for nearly two years and a half. It was a strong committee, containing, amongst others, not only the then Prolocutor, Dean Bickersteth, but the Bishop of Bedford, the Dean of St. Paul's, Lord Alwyne Compton (the present Prolocutor), Archdeacons Harrison, Hessey, and Grant; Canons Rawlinson, Gregory, Bright, and Prebendary Perry, with Prebendary Ainslie as its chairman, who afterwards sat on the Royal Commission. Now, the third of the resolutions carried when this Report was presented runs thus:—

'That this House, having regard to the history of the Church of England, and the recognition by the Convocations of the Royal Supremacy "over all persons in all causes as well ecclesiastical as temporal," is of opinion that the Crown constitutionally receives appeals, in all causes, from the Ecclesiastical Courts, to be heard in the Queen's Court of Final Appeal.'

The Commissioners, therefore, could come to no other conclusion than that there must be a Crown Court of some sort for the final determination of ecclesiastical appeals. The principle is clearly a fundamental one. It is one of the main bases on which the present union of Church and State is built up.

But before pursuing our argument further, we may as well turn aside for a space to inquire whether, if the Commissioners had not found this great constitutional question settled to their hands; or if, undeterred by a possible 'præmunire,' they had taken in hand to construct speculatively a new system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction; they could really have offered anything more satisfactory in itself, or more likely to work well, than such recognition of the Royal Supremacy as the Canons of the Church set forth, and the Convocations and the clergy individually have again and again acknowledged.

On this point there is much instruction to be gleaned from the annals of the Gallican Church, to which some interesting references are made in the evidence of the Dean of St. Paul's,¹ and in the 'Notes' furnished by him at the request of the Commissioners.² The Gallican Church, of course, never recognized the Royal Supremacy in the English sense of the term. It had its own graduated system of Courts Ecclesiastical, with a final appeal to the Pope as Patriarch under certain limitations. The State Courts were in theory quite outside the ecclesiastical administration altogether.

¹ *Report*, vol. ii. pp. 346-353.

² *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 170-176.

But
'quit
and
was t
in or
to P
in th
to cu
appel
eccle
abus
larity
the
Cour
itsel
Cour
their
deal
were
Cour
a lay
powe
nitely
trans
neces
rity i
resou
purp
lation
of th
religi
espec
comm
Gove
upon
ever
wield
to di
the s
adver
of th
that
speak

But, as the Dean observes in his evidence, they had in France 'quite as much trouble' in regard to the relations of Church and State as we have ever had. The *appel comme d'abus* was the weapon by which the civil power 'kept the Church in order,' as the Dean puts it. This expedient is attributed to Pierre de Cugnieres, a lawyer who distinguished himself in the fourteenth century by vigorous and most able efforts to curb and curtail the spiritual jurisdiction. In idea the *appel comme d'abus* is 'a complaint preferred against the ecclesiastical judge on the plea that he had exceeded or abused his legitimate powers.'¹ It has thus some similarity to 'Prohibition,' which figures so conspicuously in the collisions between our own Spiritual and Temporal Courts. But with us the civil power has contented itself with restraining the action of the Ecclesiastical Courts when they have overstepped the proper limits of their jurisdiction. The *appel comme d'abus* went a great deal further than this. Under protest that civil rights were infringed by sentences of the Church Courts, the Civil Courts drew away almost anything they pleased that touched a layman, and reheard it. The right of appeal to the civil power was, by the ingenuity of the lawyers, 'extended indefinitely to matters great and small, and that upon protests transparently frivolous'; and thus was made to obstruct that necessary exercise of discipline without which Church authority is little more than a name. 'It became the favourite resource of all persons disaffected to the Church for the purpose of defeating any attempt to put in force the regulations of her ancient discipline.'² 'In truth, the interference of the Crown with matters not only ecclesiastical, but strictly religious, was continued, systematic, and often tyrannical, especially under Louis XIV. and Louis XV.'³ The *appel comme d'abus*, in short, proved in the hands of a vigorous Government quite as effective an instrument for operating upon the spiritual independence of the Church in France as ever the Royal Supremacy did in England, even when wielded by the Tudors. And it proved far more paralysing to discipline, inasmuch as it was used by a power exterior to the system of the Church, and therefore in this respect adverse; whilst the King, with us acting as Supreme Governor of the Church itself, applied his enormous authority in a way that was, at any rate, supposed, and doubtless generally speaking was deliberately intended, to sustain and give effect

¹ Jervis, *Gallican Church*, i. 74.² *Ibid.* i. 75, 76.³ Dean of St. Paul's, *Report*, i. 170.

to the Church's own canons and rules. We do not think it could be fairly argued that the independent development of Church jurisdiction, with the *appel comme d'abus* behind it, or rather held over it *in terrorem*, proved itself in the least more successful or helpful to the Church's cause and mission than the English expedient of the Royal Supremacy. And we may conclude this part of our remarks by observing, as there is some confusion of ideas on the subject, that this admission of the *appel comme d'abus* belongs, strictly speaking, not to the Royal Supremacy, but to the Royal Prerogative. This is apparent enough when we bear in mind that in France, where the *appel comme d'abus* was invented and most systematically developed and exercised, the Royal Supremacy, in the proper English sense of the term, never found place at all.

Quite another state of things obtains betwixt the State and those religious societies which have organized themselves irrespective of it—the Dissenting sects in England, for instance. They occupy now an attitude towards the law of the land—or perhaps we might more correctly say the law does so towards them—similar to that which the Church of England would assume were she 'disestablished'; similar to that which the Church of Ireland at present exhibits, in fact. These Churches differ greatly in their internal arrangements and in their methods of discipline. Samples in great variety will be found in the second volume of the Report. The mass of information given as to 'Ecclesiastical Procedure in Anglican and other Churches' is of the greatest interest, and is, moreover, of permanent value. Much of it was obtained through the Foreign Office, and through the representatives of the Home Government in the Colonies, which could hardly have been procured through any other channels, and certainly not brought together with this completeness through any other agency than that of a Royal Commission. Whatever the organization of these communities be, they are found as before the civil power, with but few exceptions—the Russian Church and the Scotch Establishment being conspicuous exceptions—to wear one and the same aspect. They are private organizations, constituted by the free adhesion of citizens, for purposes recognized by the Government as lawful, and they are left at full liberty to manage their own affairs as seems to them good. Their jurisdiction and procedure concern themselves alone, are settled by themselves, can be altered by themselves: and they have the same control over their members that any other regularly constituted society has; such, for instance, as a political club. There is thus an

inter-
societ
by fir
adopt
called
memb
memb
cerned
the m
societ
"You
Engla
verses
been c
so far
the sp
into th
are m
our Co
Nonco
'appe
of dec
to whi
in the
author
own fo
themse
terms,
ordina
out S
denom
accept
structi
pleased
Report
which
and on
add als
which
before
this las
the Di
about t
found t
all asso

internal and consensual jurisdiction; the officers of the society are entrusted by the society with power to enforce, by fine perhaps, or expulsion as an *ultima ratio*, the rules adopted to secure those purposes for which the society was called into existence. So long as no disputes occur between members of the society as regards their rights, or between members of the society and its officers, the State is unconcerned; but when appealed to, it intervenes at once to enforce the mutual duties and rights created by compact between the society and its members; it says to every one, *Pactum serva*, "You have made a contract, and you must keep it." In England the interference of the State Courts in the controversies which have arisen within non-established societies has been of a more searching and energetic nature than is found, so far as we know, elsewhere. It looks as if something of the spirit of the Royal Supremacy had found its way even into the dealings of the State with Churches and sects which are merely tolerated. For, on the not rare occasions when our Courts have been invoked to determine disputes amongst Nonconformists, they do not, as the Commissioners remark, 'appear ever to have placed any limitation upon their power of deciding on the merits.' They expound those documents to which the litigants refer not at all after the canons' current in the particular society, nor do they accept decisions of the authorities of that society as to the sense and purpose of its own formularies. The Courts will expound and apply for themselves, will 'administer each trust according to its terms,' and will determine the meaning of those terms by the ordinary legal rules of construction. The only way to shut out State interpretations is to bind all members of the denomination, by specific agreement on their admission, to accept without question or challenge any and every construction which the authorities of the denomination may be pleased at any time to propound. The remarks in the Report (vol. i. p. xiv.) on the case of Lady Hewley's charity, which was only decided after ten years of litigation in 1843, and on the Guibord case, are very instructive. And we might add also the Huddersfield Chapel case (*Jones v. Stannard*), in which judgment was given in Chancery only a few weeks before the Commissioners began their sittings. The result of this last case produced widely-spread consternation amongst the Dissenting societies, and led to some rather *naïve* complaints about the 'bondage' in which the so-called 'Free Churches' found themselves to be under State law. But, in truth, since all associations must rest ultimately on contract or agreement,

and in this world no association can get on without possessing and using 'property,' they all come, and must come, within reach of State law. The essential differences between the position of an Established and a non-Established Church come ultimately to two: (1) the Established Church will have its disputes determined by Courts either devised by the State for the purpose or arranged betwixt Church and State—Courts which may be presumed to be better adapted for business of this nature than those constituted for the ordinary purposes of secular life; and (2) the non-Established Church can, when it finds the secular Court putting on its formularies a construction alien to their spirit and at variance with the traditions of the community, revise those formularies, and so bring matters right.

This latter point is often made a good deal of. It is urged as the conclusive answer to those who allege that the Nonconformist bodies are as much under subjection to 'Cæsar' as is the Established Church. But a reflecting man might see many good reasons why liberty to alter formularies at pleasure might prove no boon to such an organization as the Church of England. Her case is quite different from that of a small and modern sect; a sect with interests a good deal localized and not much concerned with any formularies except such as may be embedded in its trust deeds. To revise the doctrinal standards of the Church of England would be an enterprise so formidable in itself and in its results that to name it is almost enough to prove that it could be thought of, if ever, only in the last extremity. 'Anything altered here is not altered for us alone within the four seas. It affects other, sister, daughter, Churches all over the world linked to us by various ties, though possessing all the while full rights of independence.

The Commissioners, too, when brought face to face with the great and anxious topic of the Final Court and the Royal Supremacy, would have to consider not what might be theoretically the best scheme of Church jurisprudence, but what they could hope to see practically accepted by the Church as she is and by the Legislature as it is. For, of course, the Recommendations were framed on the supposition that legislation upon them is to follow. The present Ecclesiastical Courts were settled as they are by various Acts of Parliament, and nothing in the way of improvement can possibly take effect without recurrence to Parliament again. Accordingly the Commissioners advise that the ground should be first cleared by the total repeal of the Acts of 1840 and 1874—

a pro
division
and th
those
before
indeed
macy.
deman
taken
Appea
Royal
to the
to wh
trary;
and t
practic
such t
mission
of alte
and S
no cog
down
or mo
traditi
sented
guard
Bu
sioners
For it
those
we we
Weste
perhap
though
ally.
The k
anoint
the Ch
were t
was lit
done
and b
differ
commi
cise an

a proposal to that effect having been carried without a division on the motion of Mr. Jeune on April 13, 1883—and then that another set of Courts be established in lieu of those thus done away with. With such a business to launch before the Church and the Legislature, it would have been indeed chimerical to suggest the abolition of the Royal Supremacy. And it is that and no less which is involved in the demand of those who would have the Final Crown Court taken away or left shorn of its full powers as a real Court of Appeal. The English Establishment is based upon the Royal Supremacy. Doubtless that supremacy is not essential to the very idea of an establishment: the case of Scotland, to which we shall refer by-and-by, of itself proves the contrary; but it is of the essence of the English Establishment, and to have demanded its withdrawal from the Church is practically identical with a cry for Disestablishment. No such thing could be reasonably expected from a Royal Commission; and we may add likewise, that a thoughtful survey of alternative modes and forms which the relations of Church and State might assume, and have assumed elsewhere, yields no cogent reasons for thinking that any principle could be laid down for their adjustment more advantageous to the Church, or more in keeping historically with the associations and traditions of the English people, than that which is represented by an acknowledged supremacy of the Crown duly guarded and defined.

But, of course, the knotty question is—Have the Commissioners provided the necessary safeguards and limitations? For it must be confessed that we have drifted far away from those moorings which served us well three centuries ago, when we were, by no fault of our own, cut adrift from the mass of Western Christendom. Precautions and conditions must now perhaps be demanded in the interest of the Faith which nobody thought of then. The kings exercised the supremacy personally. The supremacy was as the brightest jewel of the crown. The king was the 'nursing father' of the Church which had anointed and crowned him. And Parliament was the laity of the Church by representation. If sudden and arbitrary action were taken by King or Parliament in Church matters, there was little jealousy on the part of the spirituality, for what was done was done for the Church's interest, real or supposed, and by Churchmen, if not by ecclesiastics. Now all is different. The royal functions are, as it were, 'put into commission,' and the Ministers who advise about their exercise are responsible to Parliament. And Parliament itself

can no longer be deemed a body of Church laity; the Acts of Union with Scotland and Ireland—to say no more—have disposed of that hypothesis, so that undoubtedly Churchmen have a right to demand some securities as regards the composition of the Crown Court of Final Appeal which would hardly have found place a century or two ago.

When we inquire what it is that the Commissioners have recommended in this particular, we might describe their Final Court as a restoration of the old Court of Delegates with certain new provisions as to the number and qualifications of the judges and as to methods of working. We are not surprised that they should have resorted to this course, for, in truth, the Court of Delegates, though at first devised as a sort of stop-gap until a regular system should be inaugurated through the 'Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum,' had served its purpose tolerably well for three centuries.¹ Indeed, the Delegates seldom, and we might say as regards the very few reported cases in which doctrine or worship was concerned never, reversed or varied the decisions of the Archbishops' Courts. Properly ecclesiastical suits were expected to find, and as a rule did find, final determination there. If carried further, the decree of the spiritual Court was in practice upheld. The Delegates indeed possessed all the attributes of a full and final jurisdiction. They pronounced sentence themselves, and did not merely report to the Crown; but the intermittent existence of the Court as well as the language of the statute which empowered it (25 Henry VIII. c. 19) show plainly enough that it was deemed to be in the nature of an expedient for an unusual emergency. It is not a little remarkable, too, that when the numerous and weighty Commission of 1830–1832 examined many witnesses about this very question, they were 'unable to suggest any substitute (for the Delegates) that could be represented as satisfactory, and a majority of them declined to agree without material qualification to the suggestion, which seems to have proceeded from the Commissioners themselves, that the functions of the Delegates should be transferred to the Privy Council.'²

On the whole, then, we do not see what better principle the Commissioners could have fallen back upon than that represented by the Court of Delegates. If not the best conceivable, we may well understand how it seemed to them the best available. Doubtless, there is one very unfortunate difference between the present state of things and the past

¹ See *Report*, i. p. xliii.

² *Ibid.* i. p. xliii.

The
of ci
const
Cour
legisl
about
ways
ing I
the s
fessio
ferred
the C
out o
T
judge
of wh
case
office
of the
C
posab
a dou
paris
prove
mans
believ
Comm
circu
woul
days
cants
diffic
which
shoul
woul
T
at lea
shoul
vided
by sp
such
have
There

The strength of the Court of Delegates was in the large quota of civilians always nominated in every commission, often constituting the majority, and occasionally the whole of the Court. Now we have no such resource; and perhaps the legislation of Lord Palmerston and Lord Westbury in 1857, about Probate and Divorce, mischievous as it was in many ways, was in no one respect more hurtful than in extinguishing Doctors' Commons, and with it giving a death-blow to the study of ecclesiastical law as a distinct branch of the profession. This loss, which will be found again and again referred to in the evidence, is, for the present, irreparable; and the Commissioners had to devise the best Court they could out of such materials as they had.

They have, in fact, suggested 'a permanent body of lay judges learned in the law'—twenty or thirty, we suppose—of whom, 'not less than five' shall be summoned for each case in rotation. Every such person before entering on his office is to sign a solemn declaration that he is 'a member of the Church of England as by law established.'

Objections, many and serious, readily occur to these proposals. The 'solemn declaration' is unsatisfactory beyond a doubt. It is similar to the one prescribed for 'aggrieved parishioners' under the Act of 1874, and has certainly not proved effectual in keeping aloof some about whose Churchmanship the less said the better. It is the form signed, we believe, by those placed on the Board of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. But what better test could, under present circumstances, be devised? There are few, we suppose, who would desire to revive the provisions of the Test Act in these days. And until each of our Churches keeps a 'Communicants Roll,' as some of the Colonial Churches do, it would be difficult, without such provision, to frame a satisfactory clause which would secure that none but *bona fide* communicants should take office. And if such could be framed, what chance would it have of passing into law?

The Commissioners themselves have placed on record some at least of their reasons for advising that this Crown Court should be exclusively a lay body of judges. They have 'provided in earlier stages for the full hearing of spiritual matters by spiritual judges'; and unless they could 'assume that such ecclesiastical hearing would be assured, they would not have recommended a purely lay hearing in the last resort.'¹ There is, of course, the widest difference of opinion out of

¹ *Report*, i. p. liii.

doors about almost every clause in this paragraph. Some think that the lower Courts should be purely legal, and would place two or three of the leading bishops in the Final Court: others see the necessity of having, in the last resort, a Court that represents the Crown, and would prefer that it should be merely lay. The evidence of Dr. Liddon is on this point particularly noteworthy.¹ He thinks a mixed Court of lawyers and bishops the worst of all, 'because the most embarrassing to consciences: because seeming to be one thing and being really another.' Or, as he has put it elsewhere in speaking of the Judicial Committee, 'the attendant bishops only decorated by their presence a tribunal which was essentially civil and lay; they lent to its decisions a semblance of ecclesiastical authority which it could not in fact possess, and which was only calculated to embarrass tender consciences.'² We wish it were always remembered throughout these discussions that the essential character of a Court is determined, not by the persons who compose it, but by the nature and origin of its commission—not by the men, but by the authority on which they act. A bench of magistrates is not made into a spiritual Court by the fact that, as sometimes happens, every one of them is in Holy Orders. Dr. Tristram or Sir R. Phillimore, when sitting by virtue of letters patent from bishop or archbishop, do, none the less, preside in a spiritual Court because they are laymen.³ The Crown Court, make it up as you

¹ *Report*, ii. pp. 362, 363.

² *Troubles of the Church*, Preface, p. xxv.

³ By the ancient Canon Law laymen were forbidden to exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction or to act as judges in ecclesiastical courts (see Lyndwood, iii. 3, and indeed *passim*). It is, however, as the Report observes (i. p. xxviii.), probable that the canonical requirements about the qualifications of ecclesiastical judges 'had not been strictly observed' even in pre-Reformation days. To receive the tonsure and to be in some one of the lesser orders was probably in practice deemed sufficient. The Canon Law was in this particular directly repealed by 27 Henry VIII., c. 17, which is entitled 'A Bill that Doctors of the Civil Law being married may exercise ecclesiastical jurisdiction.' It is likely enough, however, that this Bill did not at the time produce any noteworthy changes in the character of those who administered ecclesiastical law. The Bill is more remarkable, perhaps, as containing the most extravagant and exacting definition of the royal supremacy that has ever been ventured on either before or since. It would seem, however, that the employment of laymen as spiritual judges must have become extremely common, for it was one of the complaints of the Puritans at Hampton Court that laymen as chancellors and commissaries issue excommunications (*Report*, i. xxxviii.). The Puritans suggested—and by no means unwisely—that the bishops should take unto themselves for assistants the dean and chapter, 'for the more dignity to so high and weighty a censure.' In truth the archbishops and bishops seem to have tried hard to bring about

will, must be in essence a civil court, unless indeed we fall back on the fantastic idea which threatened at one time to play some curious pranks in England, and regard the Sovereign, by virtue of the Church's anointing, as a *mixta persona*, as the Czar seems to be regarded in Russia, having somewhat of a spiritual character. The Commissioners came on the whole, probably not without hesitation, and after weighing various contradictory opinions, to the conclusion that it was better to strip the Final Court of all semblance of spiritual character. Anyhow, its decisions need not then 'embarrass consciences.' They could not even pretend to be the voice of the spirituality. And that is something; yes, much.

There is another self-evident reason why they did not place bishops on it. They expect the Bishop to preside in his own Diocesan Court; at all events, when faith and worship are in question. An appeal would bring the case before the Archbishop in person, with assessors, a group of com-provincials selected for the purpose. Thus an archbishop and six bishops might have dealt with the business already, and those the ablest and fittest for the purpose. Would it have added anything to the authority of the Final Court to put two or three of the remaining com-provincial bishops on it? York has only eight bishops in all, even now, besides the Archbishop. If further counsel of this sort be needed, the suggestion made in the Report that the Episcopate of both provinces be consulted is the only one that seems pertinent.

It is far more open to doubt whether the restriction that the Crown Court must consist of lay judges exclusively be a desirable one. Such men as Dr. Stubbs and Dr. Westcott might render very valuable help in 'a cause of the law divine or of spiritual learning.' We may hope, too, that by-and-by something may be done towards restoring the study of Canon Law in our Universities; nor if the bishops are to preside in Courts can there be any reason why priests and deacons

an alteration in this particular, for the effect of the requirements as laid down by the Canons of 1571, 1585, 1597, and 1604, had they been vigilantly carried into effect, would have been in the then condition of the Universities to place the administration of the law ecclesiastical mainly in the hands of clerks in orders (see Report, i. xxxvii). The statute of 37 Henry VIII. c. 17 has been interpreted ever since the time of Charles I. as simply declaratory and affirmative, and as permitting any layman to be an ecclesiastical judge. It was not, however, until the enactment of 1874 that any layman was suffered to act in that capacity without letters patent from archbishop or bishop as his warrant for so doing.

VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV. G G

should not train themselves to plead for their brethren before their fathers in God. In the meagreness of materials for a really strong Final Court with which we are at present afflicted, it is a pity to shut ourselves out from any sources whence help may possibly be had. There is much force in the 'Reservation' made by Mr. E. A. Freeman as regards this part of the Recommendations.¹

A good deal has been said about the provision that when on appeal the judgment of the Church Court is to be varied, the cause is to be remitted to the Court below, 'in order that justice may be done therein according to the order of the Crown.' Sir R. Phillimore has put on record a weighty objection. The practical effect of this recommendation would be, he says, 'to enable these lay judges to dictate to the Archbishop spiritual sentences which he would have, perhaps, contrary to his own judgment, to pronounce.' On the other hand, the Bishop of Winchester, than whom there could hardly be higher authority on such a question, warmly defended this provision at Reading:—

'It is said that the sending the case back to the Archbishop to pronounce the decree is making the Archbishop a mere puppet, and that he would be obliged to decree what was sent back to him. Now, I say that if the Archbishop was a thoroughly conscientious man, and if he was desired by the Privy Council, or any other Court, to declare that a man who was a heretic was really teaching the truth, he would refuse to do it, and would be deposed from his Archbishopric rather than do it. No archbishop would be worthy of his position as the spiritual head, under Christ, of the Church of England, who should absolve of heresy a man who denied the doctrine of the Incarnation of Our Lord Jesus Christ. There is a great security, therefore, in sending the case back to the Archbishop.'

In this opinion we most thoroughly concur.² The remit-

¹ It is worth while to extract the 'Reservation' in its entirety:—'I wish to state my dissent from the words which confine the hearing of appeals to the Crown to members of a single profession. I would leave it open to the Crown to appoint lawyers, Churchmen, or any other persons who may be thought competent, as was the case with the Court of Delegates under the statute of Henry VIII. I hold that the examination of questions of this kind constantly calls for knowledge of a special kind, the presence of which is by no means implied in the professional learning of the lawyer, and which is just as likely to be found in other persons, clerical or lay.'

² Dean Cowie is also reported to have said at the Manchester Diocesan Conference:—'The ultimate appeal must be to the Crown. The Judges chosen by rotation, and not from policy, would advise the Crown as to what had gone wrong in the Court below, and the Crown would then return the case to that Court, in order that the Spiritual Court might, on better in-

ting judgment to the Court below is a necessary result of the important principle recognized by the Commissioners, that sentences of suspension or deprivation must be pronounced by the Archbishop or Bishop in person. The Crown Court is no more to take away Holy Orders, or suspend from sacred functions, than it is to confer them. And beyond a doubt the necessity of returning the sentence to the Archbishop's Court will tend, when grave cases arise, to beget the utmost circumspection as to what sentence is framed. Nor is it in the least likely that any such sentence would be unanimously agreed to unless the Archbishops and Bishops had been called into counsel previously. It is easy enough to imagine difficulties, and even to anticipate a dead-lock. But practical men will think that the scheme is likely in this particular to serve its purpose well enough in practice. The long experience the Church has had of the working of the Court of Delegates does not warrant the expectation of such collisions as are apprehended.

The evidence shows a strong body of opinion in favour of a Synodical Court of Final Appeal. It does not clearly appear whether those who desire this arrangement wish to include the Lower Houses of the Convocations, or whether they would restrict the judicial hearing to the Bench of Bishops only. And yet this is surely a very serious question, and one which lies at the threshold of the proposal. And what would have been its fate if offered by the Commissioners for the consideration of the Crown? Could the present Ministry, or any Ministry we are likely to see, be expected to adopt such a proposal?¹ Would Parliament listen to it for a moment? Would the laity accept it? Would even the clergy, as a whole, accept it? We greatly doubt it, at any rate until our Convocations have become much more thoroughly representative than they now are. Such a plan may be in itself theoretically sound and consonant to Church principles; it has also a certain support from the *Reformatio Legum*,² whatever the value of that may be; but formation, come to a sounder decision. He called that a very fair Court of Appeal.³ The authority of Dean Cowie is great in itself, and he is, or at least was when he spoke, also Prolocutor of the Northern Convocation.

¹ It is perhaps worth while to remark that Sir R. A. Cross—who certainly will occupy (if spared) a leading position in the next Conservative administration—was one of the most laborious Commissioners and one of the most regular in his attendance. The minutes also, meagre and guarded as they are, suggest the impression that he took a special and leading part in settling those Recommendations in particular which are now under consideration.

² *De Appellationibus*, cap. ii. ³ Ab archidiaconis et iis qui sunt infra

it is not now, nor, so far as we can see, likely to be in our days, 'within the range of practical politics.'

The precedent of the Scotch Establishment was urged on the Commissioners by more than one witness, and has been brought up repeatedly in the discussions which have taken place since the Report was issued. There undoubtedly the General Assembly is the Final Court; and the Commissioners record their opinion that—

'In no case would the Civil Court entertain an appeal from a judgment of the Ecclesiastical Court on a question of doctrine, or enter on an examination of the soundness of such a judgment before enforcing its civil consequences; or, when a case is clearly within the province of the Church Courts, interfere upon an allegation that the forms of ecclesiastical procedure had not been observed.'¹

But could we hope to extract this one feature out of the Scotch Establishment and stop there? Should we not find that practically the whole Presbyterian platform must be taken with it or left? Is there the least hope in these days that the Legislature would reconstruct the Church Establishment in England upon new lines, even if we could satisfy ourselves and demonstrate to others that these new lines are better than the old lines? The Scotch General Assembly is presided over by a Lord Commissioner, a nobleman with large but somewhat undefined powers, that of dissolving the Synod being apparently amongst them.² Are we prepared to see the Archbishop displaced by a secular nobleman presiding in the Upper House of Convocation, or rather in the Convocation, for Upper House in such a constitution there could be none? Then there is the large ingredient of lay representatives in the Scotch Assembly—180 out of a total of 440 members. It is urged, indeed, that these ruling elders are ordained; and doubtless hands are laid on them by way of admitting them to office. But we must really point out that this is to argue from names and forms, and not from facts and things. The 'elders' do not minister the Word and the Sacraments; they get their living in the world; they reflect in everything lay habits of thought and judgment. Are we prepared for a liberal admixture of the lay element in our ecclesiastical synods? Those who advocate a Synodical Court

pontificiam dignitatem ad episcopum liceat appellare, ab episcopo ad archiepiscopum, ab archiepiscopo vero ad nostram majestatem. Quo cum fuerit causa devoluta, eam vel concilio provinciali definiri volumus, si gravis sit causa, vel a tribus quatuorve episcopis, a nobis ad id constituendis.'

¹ *Report*, i. p. ix.

² *Ibid.* i. p. viii.

of Appeal may rest assured that it is only in the Scotch form of synod that such will ever be secured. And it will not be secured even so until a previous convulsion shall have snapped in twain the existing ties of Church and State.

On the whole, and bearing in mind what we must expect from a Royal Commission—that is, reform of existing institutions, and not revolution—we greatly doubt whether anything better than what the Commissioners propose is practicable, or whether anything that is practicable is much better. We say on the whole, for we do not doubt at all that improvements in detail might be readily suggested, and possibly may prove attainable also, when the time arrives, if it ever does, for action on the Report. Much is to be said for the suggestion made by Lord Devon, backed by Sir R. Phillimore, that an appeal to the Crown Court should be allowed to the accused party only. Such a restriction seems thoroughly in harmony with the tenor of the whole scheme. It is expected that, as a rule, ecclesiastical suits will reach final determination in the Church Courts. Proceedings beyond them are only to be for lack of justice in them. But he who has to complain of this must, as a rule, be the defendant who has been mulcted in pains and penalties. The prosecutor who fails to make his case good in two full trials is entitled to no compassion. He has had one chance more than he would have had with the Civil Courts in a criminal charge. As was rightly remarked at Reading, where this point was brought up by Chancellor Espin, this single provision of Lord Devon's would get rid of very many of the objections urged most strongly against the Final Court as sketched out by the Commissioners.

There are other suggested improvements which are well worth considering, but which need further ventilation and explanation. There is, for instance, the demand made by Lord Devon, and endorsed by the Bishops of Winchester and Oxford, and also by the Dean of Durham and Sir Walter James, that the lay judges should refer to the Archbishops and Bishops in all cases of doctrine and ritual. No doubt this would seem to many anxious minds a very valuable safeguard, but we can imagine that it might also in many cases prove very inconvenient, and might often cause much wholly gratuitous trouble. It would be better, surely, not to invoke the bench of Bishops without really grave occasion. And it is extremely improbable that in cases of real moment and doubt the lay judges would be satisfied to incur the heavy responsibility of ordering a decision to be pronounced in the

Archbishops' Court without having availed themselves of that recourse to the Archbishops and Bishops to which they are invited. The weight and conclusiveness of their decision would obviously and very greatly depend on its being fortified in this way.

No little discussion has turned upon the provision—which is, by the by, one of the seven resolutions regarded by the Commissioners 'as a whole,' not to be detached and considered by itself—that in the judgments of the Crown Court 'the actual decree shall be alone of binding authority; the reasoning of the written or oral judgments shall always be allowed to be reconsidered and disputed.' Whether this does or does not make any great change, or any change at all, in the present state of things is a point not quite so clear as might be thought; as indeed appears from some remarks at the end of Lord Penzance's Report. But if it be the fact, as we strongly suspect, that even at present nothing is really of binding authority except the actual decree, and that its value for the future simply depends on the correspondence between the new case and the old one—in other words, that a precedent is only of value in strict law when it is identical—then it is surely important that this should be plainly stated and understood. *Obiter dicta*, as we all know, are nothing but the opinions of the individual judge about matters not directly at issue; what are *obiter dicta* and what are grounds and reasons on which the decision is really based, and so in effect part and parcel of the decision itself—that is not always easy to determine. All the more cause, therefore, is there for clear enunciation of the principle that the decree, and it alone, is binding.

There are several practical improvements recommended by the Commissioners, about which there will be hardly any difference of opinion at all. The delivery of separate judgments, as in the Supreme Court of Judicature, instead of the hollow pretence of unanimity which is at present imposed on their Lordships of the Judicial Committee; the sitting of the judges by rotation instead of selection; the provision that there shall be at least five to sit on each case, thus securing us against having important questions dealt with by a Court weak in members;¹ the rule that they shall be 'lay judges learned in the law,' and Churchmen, which if not all that could be wished, is anyhow better than to leave the supreme seat of judgment open to any Privy Counsellor who may be

¹ The *Purchas Case*, in 1871, was heard by four judges only—the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London being two of the four.

of any creed or none, and placed on the Board for political services only ; these surely are gains very well worth securing. We cannot doubt that, if a tribunal so constituted had in fact existed from 1832, very many of the scandals and troubles of the last half-century would have been spared us. We think also that most people will be glad to hear the last of the 'three aggrieved parishioners.' If there is really any serious ground of complaint it ought to be in the power of any person, duly interested, to procure investigation by the proper authorities. The requirement of three complainant parishioners, first made in the Act of 1874, was doubtless intended to protect the clergyman from frivolous or malicious accusations. It has not served that purpose at all, but has rather proved an occasion for discreditable caballing and for some transactions that have a corrupt savour, in order to get together the 'aggrieved' trio. We heard of none of these unpleasant phenomena of our ecclesiastical life until the operation of the Public Worship Regulation Act began.

With the inferior Courts we must deal much more briefly. And, indeed, it is scarcely needful to examine at length this portion of the Recommendations, for they have met with very general acquiescence, if not approval. At Reading the suggestions of the Commissioners about the Provincial and Diocesan Courts were accepted almost as obvious, and as of course. The ancient Provincial Courts are to be restored in their full powers with direct authority from the Archbishops, and their judges in future are to possess full canonical qualifications. It is proposed, however, to give to the Archbishop the right of sitting in person where questions of faith and worship are at stake, and to provide him with experts in the way of assessors, if he desire such help. This arrangement is rather in the nature of a restoration than an innovation. No doubt it has been the rule for ages that the Archbishop of Canterbury should appoint an Official Principal to exercise jurisdiction in his name. But the judicial functions of the archiepiscopate were by no means exhausted by this appointment. The Archbishop had also his Court of Audience,¹ to which, according to theory, he might draw such matters as he thought proper to reserve for personal hearing. Doubtless suits relating to doctrine and ritual are precisely those which might be expected to be thus dealt with. The Court of Audience would seem to have fallen into disuse during the days when the Court of High Commission was in the

¹ *Report*, i. pp. xx, xxi.

ascendant (1559-1640); and no wonder, for the Archbishop always occupied a leading place in person on the latter. Nor does anything appear to have been done for reviving the Court of Audience at the Restoration, unless we regard the proceedings against Bishop Thomas Watson in the reign of William and Mary as taken before this Court. In truth, cases such as might seem to call for the personal intervention of the Archbishop hardly ever occurred from 1660 to 1832, and his Court of Audience had long before our days become completely obsolete. The Commissioners could hardly have done other or better than to replace the Archbishop in his own Court of Arches, the only surviving Provincial Court; and being there, it follows necessarily that sentences of suspension or deprivation, which the Dean has hitherto been deemed to be capable of pronouncing, should be reserved henceforth for the Archbishop in person.¹

The revival of the Consistory Courts will, we think, in principle at least, be approved of with something approximating to unanimity. The witnesses generally were in favour of it; and no wonder, for it is plain enough that the primary responsibility for the teaching and for the observance of ritual order in the diocese belongs to the Bishop. A priest of the diocese whose conduct or discharge of duty is impugned has what we may call a natural right to a hearing before the Bishop to whom he has sworn canonical obedience. Convocation has long ago urged the restoration of these Courts to their ancient functions as an essential to improved discipline. And before Convocation was unmuzzled the Royal Commission of 1830-1832 had laid special stress in its Report on the importance of reviving the ancient personal jurisdiction of the Bishop. And it was evidently the intention of the Clergy Discipline Act of 1840 that this should be done.² Un-

¹ The testamentary jurisdiction of the Archbishop, transferred to the new Probate Court in 1857, belonged to the Prerogative Court. The Court of Peculiars dealt with the parishes which were under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop. There are traces of a similar distinction to that between the Court of Arches and the Court of Audience having anciently existed at York. On the whole subject see *Report*, i. pp. xx, xxi.

² It is much to be regretted that this Act did not attempt to restore and reinvigorate the old Ecclesiastical Courts instead of sweeping away their ancient jurisdiction as regards discipline and setting up new machinery instead. The clause (23) forbidding any suit for breach of the ecclesiastical law to be commenced otherwise than is provided in the Act practically abolished the inferior Ecclesiastical Courts and gave only the clumsy substitute of the '*prima facie* Commission,' with a hearing by the Bishop in person afterwards, or (more commonly) transmission of the case by 'Letters of Request' to the Provincial Court. The Act is in many

fortu
Bish
by '
this,
beca
This
was
Dio
prov
a lit
the
cent
rent
dioc
Jud
to b
Inst
it h
resp
as '
'com
'vic
'offi
are
A '
deal
bish
prin
The
com
obje
prec
its c
ii. p
the
auth
be s
brea
only

Chu
sit
outs
com
of I
take
thin
we
labo
reg

fortunately, however, that Act gave (section 13) power to the Bishop to send any case at pleasure to the Provincial Court by 'Letters of Request,' without hearing it himself. And this, which was doubtless intended to meet exceptional cases, became the rule, more especially in the Southern Province.¹ This pretermission of their own proper duties by the Bishops was due, we suppose, to the decrepitude into which the Diocesan Courts had fallen, and to consequent difficulties in providing for a case being properly argued in them, and not a little also to the growing monopoly of Church business by the lawyers. The method of those who have tried for half a century past to improve our Church Courts has been apparently to get rid as much as possible of the Bishop and the diocesan officers, and to speed every case on its way to the Judicial Committee, there to receive what was fondly deemed to be its final decision. But this policy has not answered. Instead of diminishing and putting a speedy end to litigation, it has made it more intense and more determined.³ A

respects very loosely worded. The same person is spoken of in clause 3 as 'vicar-general,' in clause 11 as 'chancellor,' in clauses 9 and 12 as 'commissary.' In truth these terms are not at all synonymous. The 'vicar-general' is the Bishop's officer for voluntary jurisdiction, the 'official principal' for contentious jurisdiction. When these two offices are delegated to the same person he is called 'chancellor of the diocese.' A 'commissary' is properly a 'vicarius foraneus' or delegate who deals with affairs outside of the diocese, such as 'peculiars.' The Archbishop of Canterbury has a 'vicar-general' distinct from the 'official principal'; the latter officer being indeed styled 'Dean of the Arches.' The practice of dealing with serious questions of discipline by occasional commissions, as is provided by the Act of 1840, is open to very weighty objection. Each commission is a new and independent body, without precedents, experience, or rules of practice; and it leaves no record of its decisions or the reasons of them. There is a case mentioned (*Report*, ii. p. 22) in which a commission reported 'no *prima facie* case,' although the clerk incriminated had been imprisoned two months by the civil authorities for a criminal assault! The expedient of commissions would be still more objectionable if applied to charges of error of doctrine or breach of ritual order. But it seems evident that cases of misconduct only could have been in the minds of those who devised the Act of 1840.

¹ *Report*, i. p. xlvii.

² 'A Layman,' in a paper which occupies the first place in *The Churchman* for November last, observes:—'If the Bishops are made to sit in their own courts, whatever absurdities may be perpetrated at the outset will be more than counterbalanced in the future by the leaven of common sense and plain, sturdy, commercial morality, which the study of law must inevitably produce in the clergy, especially if clergymen take to practising in the Ecclesiastical Courts. We are not of those who think that the Bishops are at present sadly overtaxed, and consequently we see no objection to this proposal on the ground of the additional labour it will cast upon them. We trust it may be supplemented by a regular clerical Bar. The benefit to the clergy will be incalculable. No

clergyman might be expected to show some deference to his bishop solemnly hearing his case, and solemnly deciding it in his cathedral. If the same man be promptly despatched, as soon as complaint is made about him, to be dealt with by a great lawyer at Westminster, it is only human nature to expect that he will avail himself of every device that legal ingenuity can discover to baffle and escape his prosecutors. The Commissioners have not seen their way to abolish 'Letters of Request'; but they advise that it should only be competent to a bishop to rid himself of his duties by issuing such letters when both parties assent to his doing so.

But if the Diocesan Courts are again to come into play, much more if they are to dispose satisfactorily of the important matters which the Commissioners propose to put upon them, it is clear that something must be done to restore these Courts to activity. At present they are in many dioceses as good as dead. Nobody ever sees the Diocesan Chancellor, and the clergy very often hardly know even his name. He is very often a barrister with a large practice in London. He is naturally very well content to receive such fees as come in of themselves—those from marriage licences for instance—which practically form the present income of the chancellorship; he looks at the papers when a faculty is asked for, which in many dioceses it never is, except for very large works indeed; and he gives the Bishop an 'opinion' when a legal crux arises. But if this be all that our Diocesan Chancellors are to do, it is plain enough that the office—perhaps the nearest approach we have left in the Church to a sinecure—is in no little danger of being done away with altogether under pressure of our ardent Church reformers. In truth, we pay far too much for what we get out of the ordinary Diocesan Chancellors, little as their emoluments often are. The Bishop's secretary could do the formal part of their duties quite as well; perhaps better, for at any rate he knows something about the diocese, and is known in it. And if the Bishop wants a legal 'opinion,' he might surely pay for it as other

doubt we shall get some curiosities at first starting in the judgments of our present revered prelates, but they must not mind being laughed at; and by-and-by, when they are succeeded by men who have received a legal training in courts of law, we shall hear no more of vetoes or things of that kind.

We are sanguine enough to believe that the Bishops, aided by their Chancellors, will do better even at first than this respected writer seems to anticipate. And it is not in the least likely that the Consistory Courts, controlled as they will be by the Provincial, will give inconsistent decisions.

people
sioner
Court
jurisd
large
left n
or tra
cellon
and a
so th
divin
ruled
bisho
upon
'cum
appe
licen
dispo
secul
whic
that
dioc
crati
often
but
vital
shou
leav
appe
regu
livin
of n
be d
of m
bish
Pen

1
2
Dio
unar
'sus
to t
whol
pres
in p

people have to do. In fact, if the scheme of the Commissioners ever comes to be practically applied, the Diocesan Courts will have to waken up, to exercise such scraps of jurisdiction as have been left them, and to reclaim those large departments of their proper work which at present are left neglected, or done somehow by temporary commissions, or transacted by the Bishop in person. The office of Chancellor was designed to relieve the Bishop from the judicial and administrative cares¹ which cluster round his high office, so that he might give undivided strength and time to the diviner functions of it; for which reason we suppose it is ruled that if a bishop do not constitute a chancellor the Archbishop may compel him to do so, or even put a chancellor upon him. Instead of this relief, the modern Bishop is 'cumbered with much serving'; he has to hear in person appeals about dilapidations, applications about resignations, licences, sequestrations, &c.; to inspect builders' plans, and dispose of a number of business details belonging to the secular side of clerical life; whilst many of his sacred duties, which none should do but himself, which are the very acts that the faithful most prize and desire to have from their diocesan and none other, such as his confirmations, consecrations, and (alas!) even his ordinations, are handed over often to a suffragan or assistant bishop—an excellent man, but not the Father in God of the diocese. It is really a vital matter that the Diocesan Chancellors and their Courts should be 'in evidence.' If the barrister chancellors cannot leave their lucrative professional work in London, they must appoint in each diocese a 'Principal Surrogate,' who shall sit regularly and publicly. Business would soon gather round a living and working Diocesan Court,² and might be disposed of much more cheaply and expeditiously than it is wont to be done by modern substitutes for it.

There are certain reservations which demand a few words of notice in conclusion. There is the suggestion of the Archbishop of York, supported by the Lord Chief Justice, Lord Penzance, and others, that the Bishop should have power to

¹ Godolphin, *Abridgment*, c. x.

² It is not easy to explain the action of the Commissioners about the Diocesan Courts. On April 13, 1883, they requested, apparently by unanimous resolution, Chancellor Espin and Mr. Jeune to prepare some 'suggestions about the transfer of business now done by Commissioners to the Diocesan Courts.' On April 27 they summarily threw out the whole set of suggestions, though it would appear that several of those present did not vote. On the acts of jurisdiction exercised by the Bishop in person, see *Report*, i. pp. li, lii.

make 'a binding order' in all matters affecting public worship. This, we suppose, means that the Bishop sitting *in camera* should determine matters of this sort at pleasure, and that his word should be law, unless the aggrieved party choose to begin a regular suit and carry it to the Provincial Court. We have no hesitation in saying that such a plan would not work in these days. A bishop would be at full liberty under the arrangements actually recommended in the Report to make the utmost use of his paternal or moral authority. There is room and scope enough provided by the Commissioners for him to do his utmost in that way. But any decision of his which is to have coercive effect, and to bind under pains and penalties, should surely be promulgated with the safeguards of publicity, and after a regular hearing in court of both sides. Such private and autocratic exercise of power as the Archbishop apparently desires is emphatically objected to by the clergy.

The 'Episcopal veto,' again, is a very vexed question. No less than eight of the twenty-four surviving Commissioners have declined to concur with their brethren in recommending its continuance. And the utterances of the Conferences and the periodicals foreshadow a conflict over this particular when legislation on the whole subject of the Church Courts next comes up for consideration. The language of the Lord Chief Justice upon this matter is warm and strong; and it is apparent that to the legal mind, as represented on the Commission—and perhaps, we might add, amongst the witnesses also—the 'veto' is a stumbling-block and an anomaly. We observe that Chancellor Espin, one of the dissenting minority, explained his own views at the Liverpool Diocesan Conference, on November 6, as follows:—

'I quite agree that there must be some check upon frivolous and vexatious complaints; but I think that application for leave to begin the suit should be publicly made in the Consistory Court, and if refused, refused with reasons rendered there and then. It is a very invidious function to put on the Bishop personally. If he gives leave to go on, he seems to be surrendering one of his own clergy to be a victim; if he refuses, he seems to be obstructing the path of justice. Better to revive the old practice as it was prior to 1840, of "getting leave to promote the office of the judge," and make it a public proceeding. The Diocesan Chancellor, if fit for his business, would soon detect, on a public application, "the man of straw," or the man of spite, and refuse the application with costs.'

This suggestion may be worth considering. In other quarters it is thought that such refusal should be subject to appeal.

But we then get into a labyrinth of preliminaries, and costs too, before the leading question comes to be opened up at all.

The Commissioners recommend that imprisonment for disobedience to the orders of an Ecclesiastical Court should be abolished, and they propose instead a graduated scale of suspensions if contempt of court be continued and repeated, culminating at length in deprivation. This recommendation has been approved of in many quarters; but we must retain our opinion on the subject as declared and defended in April last. The penalty recommended by the Commissioners is not at all *in pari materia* with the offence, and is altogether contrary to the spirit and practice of Church law. Deprivation ought not to be inflicted except after a suit instituted for obtaining it, and for grave cause of heresy or incorrigible misconduct. Moreover, the unbeneficed clerk who chooses to disobey will get off easily under the scheme of the Commissioners. He can only be suspended, and upon rendering due obedience may be at once restored. But the beneficed clerk who is deprived has been mulcted in the loss of his freehold. Then, again, the Commissioners propose to retain the penalty of imprisonment for the layman, and to sharpen the weapon by simplifying the process of 'significavit' and 'de contumace capiendo.' Is it fair to incarcerate the layman for the same deed for which you simply suspend the curate from officiating? The Commissioners here seem to us to have applied the plaister in the wrong place. The offence of Mr. Green's imprisonment did not consist in the mere fact that a clergyman of laborious and blameless life was locked up in Lancaster Castle, and severed from his flock and his family, but in the fact that this was done by order of a Court which that clergyman felt bound in conscience not to recognize as entitled to govern his sacred duties. It is the character of the Court, not that of the penalties, that needed alteration.¹

It would be useless to deny that there are some serious, and we might say disappointing, omissions in the series of Recommendations which we have been reviewing. There is, for instance, a dead silence about the very large and urgent subject of the discipline of the laity. It is curious enough,

¹ It is curious and noteworthy that this recommendation was carried by seven votes only on May 25, 1883, *nem. con.* And yet there were eighteen Commissioners present. We have, no doubt, here the strange outcome of some animated and repeated discussions and divisions. See Minutes of Proceedings on April 13, 1883, and several subsequent meetings.

indeed, that the Church Courts were originally courts in which the clergy presided mainly, if not exclusively, for the correction of the laity; now these same courts are limited in practice to suits for 'the correction of clerks,' and are almost always administered by laymen. The old theory is still maintained in them; ecclesiastical suits are still supposed to be 'pro salute animæ,' and undoubtedly the layman has a soul to be saved no less than a cleric. But the 'manners and excesses' of the layman are in practice utterly neglected by the Church Courts. It is nearly thirty years, so far as we remember, since any ecclesiastical penalty has been inflicted by a Church Court in England on a layman for any mere irregularity of life. The forms and processes by 'promoting the office of the judge,' presentment at visitations, &c. remain. The spirit and power have long departed, and in order to secure some effective control over more gross and scandalous offences, jurisdiction over them has been transferred to the civil courts. Thus, defamation is removed from ecclesiastical jurisdiction by 18 and 19 Vict. c. 41; 'brawling,' in case of a layman, by 23 and 24 Vict. c. 32; and, generally, it appears that when jurisdiction is given by statute to a temporal Court in any matter, that matter is inferentially withdrawn from the spiritual Court. Of this, we suppose, perjury may be quoted as an instance; for even if committed in an ecclesiastical Court, it would apparently have to be prosecuted at common law, though in truth perjury is treated by the Courts in such a highly technical way, that it is not easy to secure convictions for it at all except in very outrageous cases.

There are many points here needing consideration and elaboration. We can merely notice in passing that although there remain large departments of the layman's conduct which the law of the land still deems to be under the control of the ecclesiastical Courts, and though all this department of jurisdiction is, and long has been, utterly inoperative, the Commissioners pass the whole subject by in silence. We may, indeed, doubt whether it would in these days prove practicable to reconstruct Church discipline at all on the ancient principle of administering it 'pro salute animæ.' Whether anything could be done in these days formally to deprive of the Church's privileges those who refuse altogether to recognize her standards of doctrine, worship and practice, is another question, far too large to be dealt with here. The abeyance of Church discipline is not unhappily peculiar to the Anglican Communion and the lands where it predominate.

ates
stan
disc
of fa
bott
are
sias

bish
sign
ratic
that
app
that
and
tical
the
sche
to b
mitt
ther
may

we f
stru
The
from
the
with
com
Com
havi
exha
nate
tutio
the
doul
prop
resp
if th
with
cons
show

ates. It could not be said that in France, to take one instance, there is any more effective administration of Church discipline than there is in England. In truth, it is the decay of faith and the divisions of Christendom which lie at the bottom of this evil condition of things; and until these causes are removed no conceivable system of laws and courts ecclesiastical will be of much avail.

The absence of any provisions for dealing with peccant bishops is another noteworthy omission, and the reasons assigned for it are very curious.¹ We are told that on consideration of the language of the Commission it does not appear that 'this subject is properly within its scope.' This means apparently that since there is no ecclesiastical Court at present that can try a bishop, a Commission appointed to consider and report upon the constitution and working of the ecclesiastical Courts has nothing under this head to deal with. But the Commissioners very properly remark that in any new scheme of ecclesiastical Courts and discipline provision ought to be made for the trial of offences alleged to have been committed by bishops and archbishops; and it is to be presumed, therefore, that this particular will not escape the legislator who may take the framing of any such scheme in hand.

The Commissioners themselves have told us how it is that we find no specific recommendation that their plan for reconstructing the Courts should be referred to the Convocations. They are 'not insensible of the advantage which might ensue' from the Report being ordered by the Crown to be laid before the Convocations of Canterbury and York; but it is 'not within the scope of their instructions' to make a formal recommendation on this point. In fact, the duty of a Royal Commission is to inquire and to report to the Crown, and having done this its functions are at an end and its powers exhausted. Any further action upon this Report must emanate from the Crown itself. There is, we believe, no constitutional obligation on the Crown even to lay the Report before the Lords or the Commons. In this particular we do not doubt that the Commissioners have done all that they could properly and discreetly do. They have significantly and respectfully indicated the course which ought to be adopted if their Recommendations are really and seriously taken up with a view to their serving as a basis for conciliatory and constructive legislation. There was abundant evidence to show that almost any scheme of Courts which should obtain

¹ See *Report*, vol. i. p. liv.

the formal recognition of the Synods, 'the Church of England by representation,' as the Canons of 1604 call them, would be accepted by those who have been most resolute in repudiating the present Courts; whilst we may well fear that a plan which had no such sanction, however wisely framed in itself, might fail to secure that loyalty of obedience which alone can make ecclesiastical jurisdiction 'work.'¹ It is really necessary, for a spiritual Court at any rate, that men should be able 'to bring it under the Fifth Commandment.'

It ought to be in a general way a strong recommendation of the scheme submitted to the Church by the Commissioners that it incurred the speedy and hearty condemnation of the Liberation Society. Whatever false pretences the members of that Society may put forward to deceive others, with the effect perhaps of sometimes deceiving themselves too, it is only too evident that they resist on system and deliberately and with all their might any and every proposal that can make the religious work of the Church easier or deliver her from any practical abuses and impediments. The Liberationists desire to make the yoke of the State more and more heavy, in the hope that at length Churchmen will be willing to be rid of it on any terms. And it is an almost infallible sign that any particular measure is distinctly for the good of the Church, that we find it vigorously denounced by them. They see that the present constitution and working of the Ecclesiastical Courts is injurious to the Church, and so they represent them as part of the essential conditions of Establishment, and insist that if any reforms are permitted it shall only be at the cost of disconnection with the State. These tactics are so manifest that no one can be deceived by them. Those who promoted the granting of the Commission, and have so willingly assisted its labours, must have been well aware that any real improvement and reinvigoration of the Church Courts, or indeed any other part of the Church machinery, would be encountered with most uncompromising opposition from this quarter. The real question is, are Churchmen fairly well agreed that legislation is really necessary, and that the scheme of the Commissioners offers a fair basis and framework for an attempt at legislating?

It looks very much as if the more sober-minded and reasonable Churchmen of all schools were coming round to

¹ It is worth while to refer here to the evidence of Canon Wilkinson, now Bishop of Truro, *Report*, ii. 75.

an affirmative conclusion about the latter of these two questions. There is some difference of opinion as to the true animus of that memorial promoted by the Dean of Canterbury, and which is being extensively signed as we write, chiefly, as it would seem, by men of moderate Evangelical views. But at any rate those who sign declare with quite sufficient perspicuity their willingness to accept the Report as a basis: and that for the present is enough. Later utterances from Ruridecanal Synods and Conferences have all, so far as we have observed, expressed at least a general approval. And there are not wanting signs that Mr. Gladstone's Government is beginning at last to realize the fact that a few services rendered to the Church may not prove a bad investment in view of the General Election which cannot be far off.

About the need of taking action for a reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts, and doing so promptly, there ought to be no difference of opinion at all. From the date when the Report appeared, we might almost say from the date when the Commission was issued, the existing methods of ascertaining what is the Church's law about doctrine and worship stood discredited. The present machinery could not again be put in motion with the least hope of good result where anything worth trying at all was concerned. Just at present there is, happily, nothing under serious contention. But this is rather a reason for dealing at once with the whole subject than a reason for delay. It could hardly be said at this moment that the Courts were reconstructed to procure or prevent any particular decision, whilst yet there is great and general dissatisfaction on various grounds with their actual constitution and working. And then there is the Colonial Church, which stands since the Grahamstown Judgment in June of last year in a truly singular position as regards us. That judgment affirmed that the standards of faith and doctrine adopted by the Church of England are not to be found only in the texts of the formularies: 'They are to be found also in the interpretation which those texts have from time to time received at the hands of the tribunals appointed by law to declare and administer the law of the Church.' And inasmuch as the Church of South Africa has synodically resolved that it will recognize only such Courts as are accepted by its own Provincial Synod, there is, according to the Privy Council, a legal disconnexion effected which is likely to be attended with various disastrous consequences. It really looks as if the Colonial Churches were to be compelled not only to submit to the

VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV. H H

Privy Council, but also to defer to the unappealed rulings of the Arches Court—indeed, we might say, of every Consistory Court in England, for all of them are clearly ‘tribunals appointed by law to declare and administer the law of the Church.’ This, of course, is a *reductio ad absurdum*; and we do not for a moment believe that these declarations could permanently stand if properly tested again. The Bishop of Capetown has, we believe, proposed a Committee of Reference to sit in England for the purpose of arbitrating upon any matters that may arise for the present. But this is only an interim arrangement. The hope of South African Churchmen is that some Final Court may, through the instrumentality of the Commissioners, be devised which their Synod may be willing to accept, and so bring matters formally and legally right. And, of course, the Grahams-town case has only brought to light a defect in the legal organization of our Communion which exists also elsewhere, and certainly ought to be cured if cured it can be.

We earnestly hope, therefore, that the opportunity afforded by the presenting of this important Report, and by the general interest and discussion of the whole subject to which it has given rise, will be seized and turned to account. It appears that the Commissioners at the outset were of almost as many minds as there were men; and that, through frank, patient, and candid inquiry and debate, they reached at last the very large measure of unanimity which is set forth in these two volumes. We think it extremely likely, if similar qualities are brought to bear upon the whole subject by Churchmen generally of differing schools, that similar results will ensue. If we should, from an unreasonable pertinacity each of us in his own opinion, make any successful reform of the Church Courts impracticable now, we shall have done what the enemies of the Church above all things desire, and have taken on ourselves the responsibility of perpetuating evils which this may be our last opportunity of remedying in the National Church of England.

IN 'f
of ha
daugh
tion in
indep
ary of
Cante
Propa
ventio
occasi
the e
peculi
the C
and c
church
of Af
exten
natur
life of
the a
marria
this i
States
legall
ducen
marry
of Ch
T
prises
Rupe
vener
and p
of the
and s
herita
dian
Now
going
the c
raisin
and f
T
muth
recen

THE FOREIGN RETROSPECT OF 1883.

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION OUT OF ENGLAND.

IN 'foreign parts' the continent of America may claim the credit of having shown the greatest energy during the past year. Our daughter Church in the United States has held its Triennial Convention in immediate view of the completion of the first century of its independent existence. In November next will be kept the centenary of Seabury's consecration at Aberdeen. The Archbishop of Canterbury sent a message of greeting from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and in graceful terms invited the Convention to nominate the preacher in St. Paul's Cathedral on the occasion of the Annual Festival of the Society on June 18, 1884. At the end of a century of labour in a country which has presented peculiar difficulties and has been harassed by many political changes, the Church of the United States has now 67 bishops, 3,513 priests and deacons, and about 373,000 communicants. It has planted churches in their integrity in Japan, in China, and on the West Coast of Africa, and has shown how great a power of adaptation and of extension a Church wholly unconnected with the civil power enjoys naturally and without criticism. There is one feature in the social life of the American States which must cause grave concern, viz. the alarming increase of cases of divorce. The law forbids the remarriage of the guilty during the lifetime of the injured party; but this is constantly evaded, because marriages contracted in other States than the one in which the divorce has been obtained are legally valid, and this anomaly is discovered to be actually an inducement to people to obtain divorces in order that they may remarry. Such a revelation tempers our satisfaction for any amount of Church extension.

The Church of the ecclesiastical province of Canada, which comprises the ten dioceses which lie to the eastward of the province of Rupert's Land, held its synod at Montreal in September. The venerable Metropolitan, the Bishop of Fredericton, spoke weightily and plain words, as his manner is. Recognizing the fact that some of the older Canadian dioceses have been unduly nursed by England, and seeing the danger of a wealthy Congregationalism usurping the heritage of the Catholic Church, he said: 'The question with Canadian Churchmen used to be, "What is England going to do for us?" Now we have to face the equally serious question, "What are we going to do for Canada?"' The Synod gave a practical response to the question, and established a general board for the purpose of raising and distributing the finances of the Church alike for home and foreign work.

The diocese of Huron, vacant by the resignation of Bishop Hellmuth, elected Dr. Sullivan as their bishop; but as that prelate had very recently been called to the more laborious See of Algoma he declined

the offer, and the Dean of Montreal, Dr. Baldwin, has become Bishop of Huron.

In Rupert's Land, which is now the great field of immigration, the Provincial Synod met in August last. In the last four years the population of the whole country has been doubled, and in the older centres the increase has of course been much greater. The whole of the southern part of the province of Rupert's Land is now crossed by the Canadian Pacific Railway, uniting Lake Superior with the Rocky Mountains, and branch railways will soon penetrate to the regions watered by the Peace River. It has been determined to make the civil province of Assiniboine the area of a new diocese. It was also determined to divide the enormous diocese of Athabasca into two. Meanwhile the claims of those regions into which immigrants are flocking are altogether immeasurable. The Hon. and Rev. A. Anson, who has thrown in his lot with this part of the Church, has been appointed by the Bishop of Rupert's Land his 'commissary in organizing missions and in the general superintendence of the proposed diocese of Assiniboine.'

A year ago the friends of the South African Church were anxiously waiting for the action of the Provincial Synod, which met at Cape Town in January last. The Privy Council's dictum in the now famous case of *Merriman v. Williams* had denied the identity of the Churches of England and of South Africa, and had laid down the extraordinary proposition that 'the standard of doctrine in the Church of England is the formularies of the Church as judicially interpreted,' *i.e.* by the Privy Council. The South African Church had declared itself to be bound 'only by the decisions of its own ecclesiastical tribunals or of such other tribunal as may be accepted by the Provincial Synod as a tribunal of appeal.' A resolution was proposed which would have made the relation of the South African Church in matters legal identical with that of the Church in this country; but the proposal never reached the clergy, having been defeated by a large majority on the lay vote. A Canon of Pacification was then proposed and carried by the bishops, the effect of which is that where property is held for ecclesiastical uses in connexion with the Church of England (as was the cathedral at Grahams-town, which was the subject of the original dispute), the holders of that property, '*being Clergy of the Church of this Province,*' shall not be liable to any obligations in the conduct of their service which would not attach to them as clergy of the Established Church of England. This was clearly a wise and statesmanlike resolution, especially as the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts had not at the time presented its Report. The action of the laity was very significant and important, but a small body of Cape laymen, calling themselves the Church of England Defence Association, have attempted to deprive the Bishop of Cape Town of his income on the ground that he is a bishop of a separatist Church. The church-wardens or sidesmen of every church or chapel in the diocese except six have repudiated all sympathy with the movement. Given only a little forbearance and a little acquaintance with history, and our

South
para
1784
of it
when
Engl
time
Conv
Unit
Chur
have
creas
Praye
Nata
to he
T
Bloer
jutor
after
conse
T
peril
one
Fren
for h
Engl
bodie
these
Anta
of fa
the l
the f
F
dioc
provi
Jama
West
year
made
neith
but
two-
T
in pa
ferm
T
Barr
to T
bish
sync

South African zealots would find that theirs was no new position. A parallel is found in the United States. The property acquired before 1784 was undoubtedly the property of the Church of England; much of it was purchased by the gift of persons resident in this country; when the Church became more independent of the Church of England than is the case in South Africa, there were from time to time questions about the transfer of property, but in 1814 the General Convention formally declared the identity of the Church in the United States 'with the body heretofore known by the name of the Church of England,' and this identity the civil courts of America have uniformly affirmed. This precedent, whose force is much increased when we remember the great changes made in the American Prayer Book a century ago, is valuable in the light of events in Natal, where the decease of Doctor Colenso seems to open a way to healing the schism which has so long existed.

The See of Grahamstown is filled by Bishop Webb, formerly of Bloemfontein. The Bishop of S. John's is now supported by a coadjutor, Bishop Bransby Key, a missionary of great experience; and after an interval of fifteen months the Rev. C. A. Smythies has been consecrated bishop of the mission to Central Africa.

The position of our missionaries in Madagascar has been full of peril and anxiety, but Bishop Kestell-Cornish has been able, on the one hand, to secure from the Government a safe convoy for the French priests, who have expressed their profound gratitude to him for his good offices; and, on the other, he has been elected by the English residents, who are chiefly the representatives of Dissenting bodies, Chairman of the Committee of Safety. In the midst of these troubles, the foundation-stone of the proposed cathedral at Antananarivo was laid by the Prime Minister, an unprecedented act of favour and sympathy. Before leaving Africa the consecration of the Rev. E. G. Ingham as Bishop of Sierra Leone (the sixth since the foundation of the See in 1852) is to be chronicled.

From the West Indies there comes the welcome news that the dioceses in that portion of the world have been grouped into one province, which has been fully organized. The Bishops met at Jamaica in November last, and elected as the first Primate of the West Indian Churches the Bishop of Guiana, now in the forty-second year of his episcopate; by a happy coincidence the election was made on his seventy-sixth birthday. The office is by canon restricted neither to the holder of a particular See nor to the senior bishop, but is to be filled on each vacancy by the bishops, a majority of two-thirds being necessary to a valid election.

This Synod passed some resolutions most deeply to be regretted; in particular, one permitting, under certain conditions, the use of non-fermented wine in the Holy Communion.

To Australasia the mother Church has sent out the Rev. Dr. Barry to be Bishop of Sydney and Metropolitan of Australasia, and to Tasmania the Rev. Canon Sandford. The selection of these bishops was in each case delegated to the authorities at home by the synods of their respective dioceses. Bishop Short, so long Bishop of

Adelaide, died at Eastbourne on October 5, in his eighty-second year. We observe with regret that Bishop Moorhouse of Melbourne has sanctioned a foolish interchange of pulpits between one of his clergy and a Presbyterian minister, the latter preaching in the Pro-Cathedral, notwithstanding the protest of the canons and some leading laymen.

The Legislature of New Zealand has sanctioned the marriage with a wife's sister, in spite of the very significant opposition of the Maori members, who declared that they regarded such a sanction as a return to the heathen customs of their race, which permitted marriage both with a wife's sister and with a husband's brother. The Bishop of Christchurch has put forth a pastoral as Primate of New Zealand, in which he enforces the fact that the laws of the State and of God being contrary the one to the other, the duty of Christian people, whether clergy or lay, is to obey the latter.

From India there comes no stirring news. The circular letter of eight of the nine Indian bishops, which in January last was addressed 'in love and humility to all of every race and religion' in India, was deemed worthy of a lengthy reply by the Roman Bishop of Bombay; for the results of the appeal thus put forth we must be content to wait. An English bishop is now working in Japan, as well as the prelate sent many years ago by the American Church. In some respects this step is peculiar, and has been taken with much care and wisdom.

THE OLD CATHOLICS.

THE Decennial Anniversary of the Consecration of Dr. Joseph Hubert Reinkens as Bishop of the German Old Catholics, which was observed on June 4, naturally leads to an inquiry into the progress made by the Church over which he presides during the ten years that have elapsed since his election. If we judge by the statistics exhibited at the last Annual Synod, we shall come to the conclusion that there has been progress, but not to so great an extent as had once been anticipated. The German Old Catholic congregations have, it appears, risen from 88 to 108, and the enrolled adherents from 35,000 to 38,500. This shows that the Old Catholic movement in Germany was not a mere ebullition of either fanaticism or hostility to Rome. It has more than held its own, which no fanaticism and no mere negation would have done, for ten years. But it has made no considerable impression either on the Ultramontanism or the Protestantism with which it is encompassed. Perhaps a cause of this has been the little attention paid to the School of Theology at Bonn, where there are at present but two students, and on which only 1,000*l.* have been expended for ten years, half of which sum was sent from England.

In the Synod held at Bonn on May 16 a step was taken towards the restoration of primitive practice by a resolution, proposed by the Pfarrer of Coblenz, authorizing the administration of the Holy Communion in both kinds to members of the Anglican Church who may present themselves at the Old Catholic altars. Bishop Reinkens has since that time issued instructions as to the way in which this is to be done; but a conservative respect for the feelings or prejudices of

the n
of th
com
tion

with
som
The
Bon
lish
of c
Bish
Arch
of S

of t
perm
help
his
prot
smo
con
priv
Nor

and
his
Arc
the
by
of
Co
Bis
Ch
pro
Bis
Pri
off
wo
the
he
ad
his
as
an
lan
so
he
G
ol

the majority of the uninstructed laity still prevents the general adoption of the administration of the Cup, though there is little doubt that the common sentiment of the clergy accords with the outspoken declaration in favour of the practice made by Döllinger at Bonn.

The Christian Catholic Church of Switzerland proceeds as usual with steps parallel to those of the Old Catholic Church of Germany, sometimes stepping before and never lagging behind her sister Church. The Theological College exhibits more vitality at Berne than at Bonn. It contains eleven students, two of whom are learning English in the hope of completing their studies at Cambridge. Letters of communion, or something equivalent to them, passed between Bishops Reinkens and Herzog (who wrote a joint letter) and the Archbishop of Canterbury on the succession of His Grace to the See of S. Augustine.

In Austria the Old Catholics have been repressed to the utmost of the power of the Government. Bishop Reinkens has not been permitted to confirm their children or to send one of his clergy to help them on an emergency, even for a day, on the plea that he and his clergy are not Austrians. Professor Löger of Vienna has publicly protested against the treatment that they receive, which, in spite of smooth words, they find to be 'nothing but tyranny over conscience, contempt of the holiest rights, and denial of legal and constitutional privileges.' Nevertheless, they are slowly making way, especially in North Bohemia.

In Italy the position of Count Enrico di Campello is exceptional and remarkable. Being excommunicated by the Pope on account of his rejection of the Papal doctrine and discipline, he turned to the Archbishop of Canterbury for recognition and help. This recognition the late Archbishop, acting as President of the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference, gave him, and referred him to the Bishop of Long Island, who is in charge of the American Churches on the Continent, for counsel and supervision. Accordingly, on May 1, Bishop Littlejohn issued a formal licence, in which, as 'Bishop in the Church of God,' he declared 'the excommunication and the anathemas pronounced against the said priest Enrico, Conte di Campello, by the Bishop of Rome, to be utterly null and void,' recognized him as 'a Priest of the Church of God,' and 'authorized him to execute his office as a dispenser of the Word of God and of His Holy Sacraments, working wherever there might be lawful opportunity, for a reform of the Church in Italy upon the model of the Primitive Church.' Until he received this Episcopal licence, Count di Campello refused to administer the Sacraments. He now ministers to a congregation of his countrymen in Rome, making use provisionally, 'until such time as the Service Book of the Church in Italy can be duly revised,' of an Italian translation of our Prayer Book. In July he came to England, and was presented to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and obtained some insight into the working of the English Church. On December 8 he was joined by Monsignore Savarese, member of the *Segnatura di Giustizia* and *Prelato Domestico* to the Pope, a grave and learned theologian, who will now probably become the leader of the reforming

movement in Italy. It is known that there are ecclesiastics of still higher position who sympathize with it. Contemporaneously with the abandonment of Vaticanism by Savarese at Rome, a new work by Padre Curci issued from the press at Florence, dedicated 'to the young clergy and the faithful laity,' bearing the significant title, *Il Vaticano Regio tarlo superstite della Chiesa Catholica*, which may be rendered, 'The Vatican Regale the worm still remaining at the root of the Catholic Church.' The statements and arguments of the book are as outspoken as the title would lead us to expect.

SHORT NOTICES.

The Book annexed to the Report of the Joint Committee on the Book of Common Prayer appointed by the General Convention of MDCCCLXXX. (Philadelphia, 1883.)

THE Report of the Committee of the General Convention of the American Church has reached us, together with the above volume, in which the American Book of Common Prayer is exhibited 'precisely as it would look were the recommendations of the Joint Committee to be adopted' (Notice prefixed). Our readers may remember that this very convenient way of laying the proposed improvements before the judgment of the Church was adopted in our own case, in the useful volume *The Convocation Prayer-Book* (London: Murray, 1880), i.e. the Book of Common Prayer 'with altered Rubrics, showing what would be the condition of the book if amended in conformity with the recommendations of the Convocations of Canterbury and York, contained in Reports presented to Her Majesty the Queen in the year 1879.' The *Book annexed* deserves, and will certainly receive, the closest and most deeply interested attention from Churchmen on this side, as well as among our American brethren themselves, under whose judgment and general criticism it will lie until their next Triennial Convention, when (we suppose) the extent to which the recommendations of their Joint Committee shall be adopted for use will be finally decided. The points aimed at are *enrichment and increased flexibility*; and some very important gains, which would be as welcome to us as to the Transatlantic Church, are obvious on even a cursory inspection. We do not, however, purpose now to go into any detail, which would be impossible within the space at present available to us—except, indeed, upon one point to be presently mentioned—but reserve the volume for a fuller consideration in our next number. Meantime we earnestly recommend it to the notice of English Churchmen, and especially of liturgical scholars, as a serious endeavour to meet more fully the needs which are felt throughout the whole world-wide Anglican Communion, and so to promote at once the glory of God and the edification of His

baptized people by a richer and worthier expression of the devotional mind and feelings of the Church.

We looked anxiously at once, hoping as it were against hope, to see if the *Book annexed* contained any indication of any re-instatement, in the book if not in the services as used, of the Athanasian Creed; as a formula which, while it is a great Act of Praise, is also, and that at least, a precious theological document; and very necessary for these times, and, as a guide to thought on the deepest Mysteries of the Faith, practically indispensable to earnest students of the Bible Revelation. The very objections made to this Creed are really only the evidence and the measure of its value and of its indispensability—we are speaking of course of objections or difficulties felt by Christian believers—for they are mostly such as arise from indefinite and imperfectly-informed belief: indefinite because imperfectly informed—or else from mistakes as to the meaning and scope of the warning clauses, mistakes removable, as we are entirely persuaded, by explanation. We are sorry to say we looked in vain. There is no trace anywhere in the book of the Athanasian Creed. The recent action of the Irish Church—which retains the Creed in its old place next before the Litany, but as a document merely, and without any Rubric precedent whatever—is an unhappy precedent in one point of view; yet it might have been pleaded by American Churchmen for what, from the point of view of their present position, would be a gain—the restoration of the Creed itself to the Book, and of the Church's sanction of it, together with the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, to the Eighth Article.

It is in connexion with this very serious matter—the position of this great formulary in the English-speaking Churches as a standard of doctrine—that we so very greatly deplore the admission by the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, without correction, of Dr. Lumby's paper on the Creeds into a volume which, together with Bishop Barry's *Teacher's Prayer-Book*, we were, on the whole, anxious to welcome: their *Prayer-Book with Commentary for Teachers and Students*. Dr. Lumby's speaking, in his account of the Nicene Creed, of S. Cyril of Alexandria as the president of the Council of Chalcedon, at the date of which he had been dead seven years, and at which (as Dr. Lumby himself within half a dozen lines tells us) he was spoken of in the past, ('Thus taught the blessed Cyril,' i.e. 'Cyril of blessed memory,') does not inspire us with confidence in his dealing with such obscure questions as the authorship and date of the Athanasian Creed. Yet we cannot but be surprised to find in his treatment of the subject no notice taken of, nor even a passing allusion made to, the strong additional evidence recently brought to light by the Rev. G. D. W. Ommanney, in his valuable works *On the Athanasian Creed*, and especially in his volume of 1880 on its early history, in favour of a much earlier origin than either Dr. Lumby, or Professor Swainson, or Mr. Ffoulkes would assign to it. We desire to commend Mr. Ommanney's studies on the question to the notice of our brethren in the States. Dr. Lumby, indeed, thinks (S.P.C.K.'s book, p. 78) that 'from the way in which Athanasius was

actively mixed up with the proceedings of the Nicene Council, it is not improbable that he put forth a Creed, and one of the Greek Fathers may be considered as stating this for a fact.' If such evidence is producible, we should have been glad if Dr. Lumby had given his readers the reference. Certainly no one can read what S. Athanasius himself says, in his *Tomus ad Antiochenos*, or in his *Ad Afros*, without seeing that he would never have dreamed of doing so. We do not claim the *Quicumque* as his work. We think Dr. Lumby puts it very gently when he says 'it is by no means certain that the *Quicumque* is his work.' But we also think that Dr. Lumby's first conclusion (p. 82) that 'though the greater part of the language of our Creed is very ancient, it was not brought together till the beginning of the ninth century,' is almost equally wide of the mark. We observe that Dr. Barry (p. 48) does accept as authentic the canon of the Council of Autun in 670 on which Dr. Lumby throws doubt, to the effect that all clerics 'shall learn the Apostles' Creed (*Symbolum*) and the *Fides sancti Episcopi Athanasii*.' Mr. Ommanney deals fully with this point in pp. 250-57 of his earlier work on this Creed, entitled 'An Examination of Recent Theories respecting its Date and Origin,' and in his recent work on its early history, pp. 88-119; see especially pp. 111, &c. of the latter.

But the evidence of the early existence of the (so-called) 'Athanasian Creed' rests chiefly on the question of the genuineness and date of the earliest commentary upon it, that, viz., which is assigned to the authorship of Venantius Fortunatus at the close of the sixth century. If that be genuine the Creed is at once carried up to the earlier date. And Mr. Ommanney produces very valuable evidence in support of the genuineness of that commentary, in the shape of four subsequent commentaries, none of which can be later than the ninth century, and which are demonstrably more or less connected with it and presuppose it. These are: 1. 'The Paris Commentary,' composed 'not earlier than the seventh nor later than the ninth century' and printed (Ommanney, Appendix, p. 376) from a manuscript of the tenth century, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale of Paris. 2. The 'Oratorian Commentary,' drawn up 'soon after the Sixth General Council—at the close of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century,' and edited by Mai and Pinus from a manuscript in the Vatican Library, and reprinted in Mr. Ommanney's Appendix. 3. The 'Bouhier Commentary,' a little later than the Oratorian, and drawn partly from it. This is printed for the first time by Mr. Ommanney, Appendix, p. 355, from two manuscripts in the Public Library at Troyes, collated with one in the British Museum. And 4. 'The Troyes Commentary,' dating between A.D. 649 and A.D. 680, printed, for the first time, by Mr. Ommanney in his Appendix, p. 311. 'The author of the Oratorian Commentary,' Mr. Ommanney tells us (p. 275, in his concluding chapter, which deserves careful study)—

'asserts in his preface that he had seen old manuscripts in which the Creed was invariably entitled as the work of S. Athanasius.' Manuscripts

which were old at the beginning of the eighth century, or possibly the end of the seventh, 'could not,' he fairly says, 'have been written later than the sixth. And if the *Quicumque* was commonly ascribed to S. Athanasius in the sixth century, then it could not have been composed later than the conclusion of the fifth century, and might with much more probability be assigned to the early half of that century. The fact of its being regarded as his work in the sixth century proves its earlier origin, though it does not prove its genuineness. . . . Thus we are led to believe that the Athanasian Creed was composed certainly not later than the end, probably not later than the middle, of the fifth century.' (Pp. 275, 283.)

With regard to the question of authorship, Mr. Ommanney remarks very justly (p. 284)—

'Really the *Quicumque* might be more fitly called the Creed of S. Augustine than of S. Athanasius; for if it represents the teaching of the latter in substance, as no doubt it does, it represents that of the former in letter as well. The similarity is of such a character, of such extent and closeness, as to point convincingly to one of two alternatives—either that the Creed was drawn in some degree from S. Augustine's writings or that S. Augustine drew from the Creed. The latter hypothesis is clearly most improbable. That the great Western Doctor should have been acquainted with such a momentous exposition of the Faith without dropping a single hint of such a thing in the whole course of his voluminous writings—nay, more, that he should have repeatedly made use of its language without once acknowledging the source of his inspiration, is inconceivable. We are therefore thrown back upon the former alternative. The fact then appears to be that the author, being thoroughly familiar with the writings of S. Augustine, in framing the Creed was led to adopt their language wherever it suited his purpose. And this being the case, it follows, not only that the Creed was not the composition of the illustrious opponent of Arianism, with whose name it is commonly associated, but that it could not have been drawn up till after the publication of those works of S. Augustine with which it is connected . . . and probably was not composed before 428. . . . And of all the persons to whom the *Quicumque* has been assigned, S. Vincent of Lerins is the only one to whom it can be applied with any degree of probability. Still all this does not amount to positive proof. . . . But if this Father was not the author of the *Quicumque*, such is the connexion between that and the "Commonitorium" as to necessitate the conclusion either that he was acquainted with the former at the time when he wrote the latter, or that the author of the former, whoever he was, drew some of his expressions from the latter.'

This is important reasoning. It tends to carry up the *Quicumque* towards the great conciliar epoch, when, as the necessary result of controversy and as a defence against heretical thought, the Church's statement of the great fundamental doctrines of her Faith was deliberately formulated; and so to reduce greatly any objections to it or disparagement of it which rest on a mistaken belief of its comparatively late origin. This great statement of the One Faith has the seal of the Church's general acceptance for ten centuries at least, probably for nearly fourteen; a consideration which tells heavily against any communion which ventures to dispense with it or to dismiss it from its standards. Another helpful precedent which any

truly Catholic element in the American Joint Committee might have pressed is furnished by the Note framed upon this Creed by our own Convocation in 1879. The opportunity might have been taken of drawing up some fuller and better explanation with which to accompany its restoration to the American book. What needs, of course, to be said is, (1) that the monitory clauses warn men of the spiritual consequences, not of an imperfect grasp of great spiritual truths, which may never have been fully presented in detail to their acceptance, but of wilful rejection of and apostasy from essential and vital truths presented, known, and apprehended; and that, consequently, they have no reference whatever to the case of non-Christians; and (2) that if the language used as to the spiritual consequences of not 'holding' the fully presented Faith be severe, it is therein no more than the echo of the Lord's own words. We cannot help suspecting that our American brethren are hampered by another difficulty attaching to this Creed—namely, its assertion of Eternal Punishment for evil-doing, its one really damnatory clause. The tendencies to 'Universalism' or 'Annihilationism' are perhaps stronger or more diffused in America than here. But it is the office of the Church of Christ to teach the truth as He taught it; to lead men's minds, and not to be led by them, in matters of faith. And it is important to remember that what touches faith is, as the American Church herself declares in the opening sentence of her 'Preface' of 1789 to her Prayer-Book, of infinitely greater importance than 'forms and usages of worship.'

The Annotated Book of Common Prayer: Being an Historical, Ritual, and Devotional Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. Edited by the Rev. JOHN HENRY BLUNT, D.D., F.S.A. Revised and enlarged Edition. (London: Rivingtons, 1884.)

THE indefatigable Editor of this excellent Commentary has apparently not desisted, during the sixteen years which have elapsed since the first edition appeared, from efforts to improve and to supplement it from time to time. Accordingly, this new edition shows signs of great and laborious care bestowed upon the improvement of many parts; and the result is a much better book, and issued, we believe, at a considerably lower price—a guinea, instead of the thirty-six shillings of the former edition. The 'Historical Introduction' has been rewritten, with much additional matter; the 'Notes on the Minor Festivals' have been *entirely* rewritten by their author, the Rev. J. T. Fowler, of Durham; the text of the portions of Scripture which are embodied in the services have been collated, *i.e.* the Gospels and Epistles with carefully selected exemplars of the Authorized Version, and the Psalms with copies of the 'Great Bible'—of which the text is remarkable as representing the Vulgate, and through that being founded on the LXX. The 'Introduction to the Ordinal,' again, has been greatly lengthened and improved. An addition of great importance is made in the 'Chart of Ministerial Succession,' partly given on p. 656, and the remainder on pp. 668–672. But it should cer-

tainly have been given *altogether*. It was a most unfortunate error to break it into two parts, and will, we fear, tend to encourage in some minds the fancy of a solution of continuity between the Primitive Church and the modern Church of England, or at all events will fail to exhibit with the clearness that might have been wished the continuous transmission of the ministerial commission from the earliest times to the present. The Editor takes note that a MS. Prayer Book was subscribed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and annexed by Parliament to the Act of Uniformity; so that it is, in fact, the norm or standard of ritual legality; and that between it and the text of the Sealed Books sundry differences, as we are led to infer, are found. He was unable to obtain permission to formally collate this MS., though we hardly see why, or what objection there could have been to the clergy of England being made acquainted with the *ipsissima verba* of that which is the law to which they are expected specially to conform their ministrations. But however, by the kindness of Lord Cairns, says Dr. Blunt, he was enabled 'to make use of the manuscript to some extent,' so that he is able to state that the text now given 'faithfully represents' the MS., except with regard to spelling. If he had also given a list of various readings, he would have assisted very much those students who require to compare the two. But we imagine, from his not saying anything on the subject, that none of the variations are of great importance.

We are heartily glad to find a work of such great value and usefulness reappearing in a form so considerably improved.

An Examination of the Structural Principles of Mr. Herbert Spencer's Philosophy; intended as a proof that Theism is the only theory of the Universe that can satisfy reason. By the Rev. W. D. GROUND, Curate of Newburn, Newcastle-on-Tyne. (Oxford and London: Parker and Co. 1883.)

MR. GROUND has produced a work which the most irreligious of scientists cannot accuse of prejudice, nor the most narrowminded of religionists suspect of unbelief. We have found the union of scientific and religious enthusiasm which the book displays exceedingly attractive. We are also thoroughly at one with the author in his thesis that Theism is the only theory of the universe which will satisfy reason, and in his persuasion that this thesis may be proved out of the works of Mr. Herbert Spencer himself.

Other authors have maintained that Mr. Spencer's principles rightly considered are irreconcilable with the Agnosticism which is generally supposed to be their outcome. We ourselves in many former articles have maintained this proposition. And in fact it needs no extraordinary power of thought to discover that there must be something inconsistent in a philosophy which recognizes a supernatural factor in the creation and direction of our life and mind, while it at the same time requires us to put aside this factor as unknowable; which regards evolution as the method of the mind's growth and the source of every principle of belief on which a philosophy can found itself, while at the same time it demands of us that we should uproot from

our own nature those religious tendencies which are among the most fixed and certain legacies to the mind from the evolution of ages past. We are glad also to reflect that we have never said anything inconsistent with that profound respect which Mr. Ground expresses for the qualities both intellectual and moral revealed in Mr. Spencer's works. If we have not expressed this admiration with quite the same strength of language as Mr. Ground, neither have we thought it necessary to employ such vehemence of denunciation as that with which he sometimes visits his idol. He finds on the one hand that Mr. Spencer's edifice has an intellectual majesty rivalling the framework of the heavens; on the other hand he does not shrink from declaring that, in the argument which Mr. Spencer has submitted on a very cardinal point, 'there is scarcely one sentence which does not contain either a distinct misstatement, a palpable fallacy, or a clear *petitio principii*.'

Mr. Ground's punishment, therefore, when he feels called on to inflict it, is by no means sparing; but, like some severe mothers, he will suffer no one to administer it except himself. He feels no hesitation whatever in declaring the insufficiency of all previous criticisms of the Cosmic philosophy, and the absolute erroneousness of most of them. For twenty years, says he, Mr. Spencer's system

'has confronted our Theism as a formidable enemy, and it may, I should fancy, be assumed that all the Professors of philosophy in all the universities of Christendom have had free scope, and have done what they could to disprove his arguments. Yet, from some fair acquaintance with their writings, I venture to say that they have contributed nothing of any importance, and that they might just as well have been silent.'

'For years past the universities have had no philosopher, therefore they have been utterly unable to cope with a man like Mr. Spencer.' Yet, to mention no others, this work evinces no acquaintance with the criticisms of Mr. Spencer's metaphysic published by the late Professor Green, a man, as many think, not unworthy of the title of philosopher.

We infer from the last-quoted passage that Mr. Ground does not himself belong to a university. We shall make bold therefore to say that in spite of the undoubted ability and suggestiveness of the volume, it displays defects which a severer intellectual training would have enabled its author to avoid. Although the book can by no means be pronounced too long for its subject, there is yet in it no slight amount of repetition. The style, though often eloquent, is very unchastened, and the reader is annoyed by the recurrence of such turgid epithets as 'massive' and 'full orb'd.' But these defects would be of slight importance if the logic were never hasty or the use of terms free from assumption. It is peculiarly necessary that the utmost care in these respects should be observed when the object in hand is to convict a philosopher of inconsistency. Yet we cannot honestly deny that we seem to discern such defects in points by no means unessential to Mr. Ground's argument.

For instance, his primary proposition is that Mr. Spencer's system rests upon the assertion of mind as an existence totally distinct

from matter. If this proposition could be maintained it would indeed reveal a strange misconception of the philosophy on the part as well of its friends as its foes, and not least on the part of its author. It becomes us therefore to scrutinize with great care the proof of it which is offered, nor would there be the slightest use in pretending to think that proof sufficient, unless we were quite sure that such was the case.

Mr. Spencer does indeed contend that the division between *subject* and *object*—the profoundest of distinctions among the manifestations of the unknowable—is irresistibly given us in consciousness. But when Mr. Ground, in quoting this passage, inserts in parenthesis 'by unknowable he means Matter and Mind,' we know not where he finds authority for such an explanation of his author's meaning. We do not in the least believe that Mr. Spencer means any such thing. The distinction of object and subject is a necessity of thought. Thought finds both within itself, and anyone who can persuade himself that thought is a property of matter will be able also to believe that the distinction of object and subject proceeds from the same source. If this be the case even with professed materialists, much less should Mr. Spencer, who does not know enough about matter and its properties to call himself by that name, be required to admit, as Mr. Ground (p. 60) demands, that his assertion of the distinction of object and subject is equivalent to asserting that of mind and matter. In truth, the attempt to identify these two distinctions with one another might lead to very awkward results even for believers in the immaterial nature of the soul. For we cannot argue or even state any theory about our souls without *ipso facto* making our souls the object of our thought; and if the object of our thought must be matter, the soul will thus be proved material. Again, we find Mr. Ground attributing to Mr. Spencer the doctrine that 'mind and matter are two separate entities.' We do not thus read him. He does indeed declare that 'we are obliged to postulate a substance of mind that is affected before we can think of its affections.' But he adds that 'we can form no notion of a substance of mind absolutely divested of attributes connoted by the word substance; and all such attributes are abstracted from our experiences of material phenomena.' 'We can think of matter only in terms of mind; we can think of mind only in terms of matter.' His position, therefore, plainly is that while the *manifestations* which we call material and those we call mental are wholly distinct, yet when we attempt to think of the substance or entity which underlies these manifestations, we are wholly unable to make any such distinction. And if Mr. Ground had continued the citation to which we are alluding a sentence or two further, he would have found Mr. Spencer asserting as the true conclusion from the preceding pages of his work, 'that it is one and the same Ultimate Reality which is manifested to us subjectively and objectively.'¹ We do not imply that we consider Mr. Spencer's reasoning upon this point to be sound. Very far otherwise. But Mr. Ground is pro-

¹ *Principles of Psychology*, vol. i. p. 627.

ceeding on what he believes to be the structural principles of Mr. Spencer's philosophy, and it can plainly lead to no useful result to alter Mr. Spencer's doctrine of one entity under two manifestations into that of two separate entities.

Accordingly when Mr. Ground (p. 73) demands whether it is in the category of mind or matter that Mr. Spencer places the force out of which he constructs the universe, we conceive that a reply will be refused. It will be said that the words mind and matter, intelligent and unintelligent, alike belong to manifestations, and not to the ultimate reality which is manifested. And even if it were conceded that we must attribute to the Unknowable something akin to mind as well as to matter, that something which lies behind mindstuff would be of so indescribable a character, and so utterly unlike its future developments in the human intellect, that our gain in attaining it would not be large.

We might not have greatly cared to dwell on the misconceptions of Mr. Spencer's teaching which we cannot but believe Mr. Ground to display, if it were not that in doing so we reinstate the credit of those replies to the Cosmic philosophy which are based upon the belief that it is materialistic. Mr. Ground considers this to be a misconception. Even if Mr. Spencer spoke the language of Professor Tyndall, and discerned in matter the promise and potency of all forms of life, he would bid us take into account the notion of matter which such teaching implies, and recognize it as rather endowing matter with life than degrading life to the mechanism of matter. Now, mind is plainly a form of life. Does Mr. Ground, then, in spite of his wide distinctions between mind and matter, conceive it possible to regard matter as endowed with mind? We thought he considered them as wide asunder as the poles. Even were this possible, it would not justly relieve these authors from the charge of materialism. It goes without saying that a philosopher who regards thought as a function of matter must describe matter less grossly than one who relegates mind to another region. But if he regards life and will as dependent upon those changes of matter which we all know to be evanescent, and as vanishing with its dissolution, it matters very little to us what fine terms he may apply to matter. Whatever elegant descriptions the wolf may give of himself, the essential question is whether he is going to eat us up. And if Professor Tyndall, or even Mr. Spencer himself, chains our existence in all its forms, bodily, mental, and spiritual, to the arrangement of material atoms, we must regard him as a genuine materialist. Lucretius finds matter to be instinct with poetry, but he is not the less a materialist.

It will be gathered from these observations that we do not believe Mr. Ground to have produced an unassailable reply to his illustrious antagonist. Nor do we believe that previous attempts in the same direction are so entirely useless as Mr. Ground confidently pronounces them. At the same time we should be sorry to deny that his work contains many highly suggestive chapters. We should place first among them Chapter X., in which Mr. Spencer is indicted, and

we th
notbi
actual
why
subst
Mr. S
foun
very
plain
feelin
that
faint
unkn
of m
when
it has
indee

Anti-

OUR
two l
seem
The a
ing th
This
time
a pro
is in
shoul
ness
speci
seems
oppo

It
effect
Volta
show
ment
guilty
might
from
form
differ
sional
hearti

T
class
lightl
VO

we think convicted, of inconsistency, in declaring that the Ego is nothing more at any given moment than 'the aggregate of feelings, actual and nascent, which then exists.' We do not, indeed, quite see why Mr. Ground encumbers the argument with the discussion on substance and phenomena which occupies the preceding chapter. Mr. Spencer's own nomenclature would have formed a sufficient foundation for the argument upon the Ego, without insisting upon very debateable terms which he has deliberately avoided. But it is plainly inconsistent in Mr. Spencer to deny that the aggregate of feelings and ideas makes up the Ego, when he has previously applied that term to the 'principle of continuity forming into a whole the faint states of consciousness, moulding and modifying them by some unknown energy.' That to which such very real functions as those of moulding and modifying are assigned cannot be pushed away when Mr. Spencer pleases behind the aggregate of feelings which it has itself moulded. Here Mr. Ground occupies a strong position indeed, and the point is one of supreme importance.

Anti-theism: Remarks on its Modern Spirit. By RICHARD HILL SANDYS, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. (London: Pickering and Co., 1883.)

OUR attention was first drawn to this volume, a small octavo of some two hundred pages, by a notice in a contemporary. The reviewer seemed to be rather shocked and scandalized at the tone of the book. The author had, it appeared, occasionally indulged in sarcasm respecting the position and arguments of some of the champions of unbelief. This is no new phenomenon, nor can we expect that it will not from time to time recur. That Ahab should freely scatter taunts against a prophet of the Lord, and stigmatize him as the troubler of Israel, is in some quarters deemed only right and natural. But that Elijah should mock the prophets of Baal, and be sarcastic on the powerlessness of the false god on behalf of his votaries—this is indeed a sad specimen of irreverence, a transfer of weapons which were only, it seems, intended for the benefit of one side in the contest between opposing creeds, or between belief and scepticism.

It is difficult, we might almost say impossible, to predict the effect of different books, or sights, or events upon individual minds. Voltaire made merry with the earthquake of Lisbon. To him it showed the absurdity of any plea for the existence of divine judgments. Here was Lisbon overwhelmed, while at Paris, a city just as guilty, people were dancing. A vision of the coming Reign of Terror might have made even Voltaire hesitate about the immunity of Paris from spectacles of misery and awe. It is the same with sights. The form of worship which attracts one temperament is found to a different cast of mind to be absolutely repellent. And books occasionally remind us of those fruits, such as black currants, which are heartily appreciated, or else as thoroughly disliked.

The essay of Mr. Sandys may probably be complained of by one class of sceptical readers as somewhat discursive, and as passing too lightly over some difficulties, as, for example, those connected with

VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV. 11

revelation. Yet we cannot but think that some really thoughtful minds might probably find attention more forcibly arrested by portions of this book than by many a more formal and elaborate treatise. The believer may likewise find suggestive hints very capable of being worked up into an apologetic discourse or address. The index at its conclusion is very useful, and a real help to the student. A single extract will give some idea, if not of the main argument, at least of the many interesting *obiter dicta* scattered through its pages. Here, for instance, is a thoughtful word on behalf of a faculty which has always seemed to us to fare rather badly at the hands of even so great a thinker as Bishop Butler. (That eminent philosopher speaks of imagination as 'that forward and delusive faculty.' But even he admits that it is 'of some use to apprehension.')

'It has been said that the imagination only recalls and deals with the shadows of things we have seen, the ideas or images of past impressions, and cannot therefore add to our knowledge, or do other than distract us in our search for it. That may be in part true, but it is an undue limiting of the faculty itself to the instruments with which it works. These shadows or images are not the imagination itself, nor do they present any full measure of its work. The imagination is not an isolated faculty, nor ever perhaps in full action except in association with others from which it receives force and grace continually. With some of these it is in such close affinity that it is difficult to draw any hard-and-fast line of division between them. We know not that we can invent or even reason without some aid from the imagination; and that aid, until we have so developed ourselves as to be able to perceive the whole world of possible ideas carpeted out before us according to their tribes and relations, so as to be taken in at a glance, we had better perhaps hope always to receive until philosophy or ourselves have come to an end' (p. 21).

There is much real power in the last forty pages of Mr. Sandys' essay, but extracts would not fairly represent it. In passing, we cannot help saying that the author's own lines of thought seem so often tintured with metaphysics that we question whether he is justified in his reproaches (p. 25) against that branch of mental science. Assuredly, Plato and Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Dante, Descartes, with many more, were all metaphysicians, and owe to their studies in that direction a great part of the empire which they have exercised over their own and subsequent generations.

Materialism, Ancient and Modern. By a late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1881.)

THIS little book is barely the length of an ordinary paper to be read at the meetings of a scientific or literary society. As a paper it would deserve commendation and might do good service, especially in the way of awakening discussion; but it may be doubted whether it was worth publishing in its present form. The author's description of ancient materialism—that of Lucretius—is clear, and his exposition of its shortcomings satisfactory; but then nobody now holds the Lucretian theory. Of modern materialism he knows but little. It is needless to spend words in showing that nothing is gained by

supposing a blind unintelligent power, called Nature, to be the cause of phenomena, for nobody makes such a supposition. When a modern materialist says that a phenomenon is due to a 'law of nature,' he means one of two things. He either has a hazy notion that law itself is a cause sufficient to account for things happening according to law; or he has a clear notion that there is no need to account for things at all, but only to classify and compare them. In order to get rid of the troublesome prejudice of mankind, that after all things have a cause somewhere, he assumes that causation is the same thing as association; and thenceforward to those who ask for causes he simply serves out uniformities. It is as if the governor of a besieged city should label sawdust as 'flour,' and then deal it out to famishing citizens. This, however, is the real position of modern materialism, and on this the author before us says nothing. Nor are his physics more complete than his metaphysics; for he says (p. 16) 'no one at the present day believes that the ultimate particles received by modern science actually come into collision with each other'; whereas in what has been styled the Atomo-mechanical school of physics (now somewhat fashionable) all change is supposed to be due to such collisions. It is to be regretted that the author should not have read more deeply in the subject he treats, for his style is terse and good, his reasoning clear and thoughtful; but unfortunately it is in most cases wide of the mark.

Natural Law in the Spiritual World. By HENRY DRUMMOND, F.R.S.E., F.G.S. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1883.)

WE will begin our notice of this most remarkable book by saying that everyone who is interested in religious questions should read and study it. Few will agree with it throughout, some may perhaps disagree with it altogether, but no one can fail to be impressed with the beauty of the thoughts, the skill of the illustrations, the fearlessness with which the analogical method is applied, and above all the deep moral and spiritual earnestness which animates the whole work. It is a book that throws one back upon oneself, and pierces through the crust of conventional and easy-going religion to lay bare the actual foundations of a man's principles and conduct. All really spiritual writing should resemble, however distantly, the 'Word of God,' which is 'quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, . . . and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart,' and we can give Mr. Drummond no higher praise than to say that this description was continually before the mind while reading his book.

Mr. Drummond's object may be described as the attempt to enlist the modern scientific conception of Law on the side of dogmatic religion. As a student and teacher of natural science he sees the 'Reign of Law' gradually extending itself till it covers the whole realm of knowledge and experience, and he recognizes the immense strength that is thereby given to our belief in scientific doctrines. Then he turns to theology and sees in it 'the Great Exception.'

'The Reign of Law has gradually crept into every department of Nature, transforming knowledge everywhere into Science. The process goes on, and Nature slowly appears to us as one great unity, until the borders of the Spiritual World are reached. There the Law of Continuity ceases, and the harmony breaks down.'

In a noteworthy passage he points out that this is the secret of that fear of science which is shown by theologians in the present day.

'Whence this dread when brought face to face with science? It cannot be dread of scientific fact. *No single fact in science has ever discredited a fact in religion.* . . . What, then, has science done to make theology tremble? It is its method. It is its system. It is its Reign of Law. It is its harmony and continuity. The attack is not specific. No one point is assailed. It is the whole system, which when compared with the other and weighed in its balance is found wanting. An eye which has looked at the first cannot look upon this. To do that, and rest in the contemplation, it has first to uncentury itself.'

With these convictions, therefore, Mr. Drummond endeavours to take away this reproach from Religion by extending the sphere of Law into the spiritual world. He gives us, so to speak, a chart, in which we may trace some of the laws which govern the natural world prolonged into the spiritual, and working there on different materials but in the same way as they work here, where science has discovered them. What is original in Mr. Drummond's book is the combination of this analogical method, which has generally been apologetic or at least scientific, with very great moral and spiritual force and insight. One forgets the evidential value of the method in the deep impression made by the spiritual tone of such papers as 'Biogenesis,' 'Growth,' 'Eternal Life,' 'Environment,' which start from some well-known scientific fact and reach the loftiest heights and the most profound depths of the spiritual life. A convenient, though by no means the most impressive, instance for our purpose is his development of Dr. Mozley's description of the two characters, the Christian and the merely moral character.

'We have all met these two characters—the one eminently respectable, upright, virtuous, a trifle cold perhaps, and generally, when critically examined, revealing somehow the mark of the tool: the other with God's breath still upon it, an inspiration; not more virtuous, but differently virtuous; not more humble, but different, wearing the meek and quiet spirit artlessly as to the manner born. The other-worldliness of such a character is the thing that strikes you; you are not prepared for what it will do or say or become next, for it moves from a far-off centre, and in spite of its transparency and sweetness, that presence fills you always with awe. A man never feels the discord of his own life, never hears the jar of the machinery by which he tries to manufacture his own good points, till he has stood in the stillness of such a presence. Then he discerns the difference between growth and work. He has considered the lilies, how they grow.'

With what insight, again, does he penetrate one of self-deception's favourite disguises in the remark, 'Our correspondences, as a whole, are not with evil, and in our calculations as to our spiritual

condition *we emphasize the many negatives rather than the single positive.* It is difficult to praise too highly the ingenuity with which the scientific fact is expanded into the spiritual law in 'Semi-Parasitism' and 'Parasitism,' or the grandeur of the conception, in 'Classification,' of the evolution of evolution by means of the development of a Third Kingdom, the Spiritual, out of the Organic, as that is developed out of the Inorganic. 'Biogenesis' places a barrier between the Organic and the Inorganic, and the same law applied to the spiritual world places a similar barrier between the Spiritual and the Natural. Thus even the breaks, the catastrophes, of evolution are seen to be no isolated phenomena, but moments in a series.

'As evolution unfolds everything else, it is now seen to be itself slowly unfolding. The straight line is coming out gradually in curves. At a given point a new force appears deflecting it; and at another given point a new force appears deflecting that. These points are not unrelated points; these forces are not unrelated forces. The arrangement is still harmonious, and the development throughout obeys the evolutionary law in being from the general to the special, from the lower to the higher. What we are reaching, in short, is nothing less than the *evolution of Evolution.*'

We cannot, however, allow our admiration for the very great merits of this book to blind us to its defects; but if, in mentioning these, we may seem over-critical, it is because we feel that a writer of such power and originality should have every opportunity of making his work perfect; and knowledge of defects is the first step towards perfection. To turn, then, to criticism.

Our objections will chiefly concern the 'apologetic' portion of the book, which is certainly, as Mr. Drummond himself seems to feel, weaker than the more practical part. To put it shortly, the author appears to be stronger in science than in logic. There is a certain vagueness about his fundamental conceptions, which makes us suspect that he has not completely thought out his subject in its more abstract bearings. For instance, the central notion of his system is Life; the whole book depends upon the parallel, if not identification, between eternal life and natural life, so as to make it possible to apply the law of Biogenesis to the gift of the new life. But, in the first place, Mr. Drummond never proves, and hardly attempts to prove, that the word 'life' has the same meaning in the two cases; and in the second place, he himself declares that the two kinds of life are not the same. 'The natural man belongs essentially to this present order of things. He is endowed simply with a high quality of the natural animal Life. But it is Life of so poor a quality that it is not Life at all. He that hath not the Son *hath not Life*; but he that hath the Son hath Life—a new and distinct and supernatural endowment.' But if the Life that Christ gives us is a different thing altogether from 'the natural animal Life,' how can we prove that the law of Biogenesis applies to it? Yet Mr. Drummond's whole scheme depends upon this application.

A similar confusion seems to us to prevail in his treatment of

Revelation and Nature. The grand difficulty of the analogical method is to leave a place for Revelation. If Nature can show us the laws of the spiritual world already at work, if religion is so 'natural' a thing that the natural world leads us up to it, why should we have more than natural religion? Or a further step may be taken, and the question asked, If religion corresponds so closely to the intellectual and emotional nature of man, and to the natural laws which he has discovered in the world, why should we ascribe to it more than a purely natural and mundane origin? Does not analogy prove that religion follows the lines of all human knowledge and human thought, and that, therefore, it is a mere human development, because the laws of the spiritual are identical with those of the natural world? Mr. Drummond, of course, would reject such a conclusion absolutely; it is far removed from his theology. But he is not always consistent or clear in his language. He tells us in an admirable passage (p. 76) of the insufficiency of natural religion.

'A moment's reflection ought now to make it clear why in the Spiritual World there had to be added to this mystery the further mystery of its proclamation through the medium of Revelation. This is the point at which the scientific man is apt to part company with the theologian. He insists on having all things materialized before his eyes in Nature. If Nature cannot discuss this with him, there is nothing to discuss. But Nature can discuss this with him—only she cannot open the discussion or supply all the material to begin with. . . . What is this but the demand that a lower world, hermetically sealed against all communication with a world above it, should have a mature and intelligent acquaintance with its phenomena and laws? Can the mineral discourse to me of animal life? . . . The barrier which separates Kingdoms from one another restricts mind not less than matter. Any information of the Kingdoms above it that could come to the mineral world could only come by a communication from above. An analogy from the lower world might make such communication intelligible as well as credible, but the information in the first instance must be vouchsafed as a *revelation*. Similarly if those in the Organic Kingdom are to know anything of the Spiritual World, that knowledge must at least begin as Revelation.'

This is very true and well said; but it is hardly consistent with Mr. Drummond's language a few pages earlier (p. 51).

'It is clear that we can only express the Spiritual Laws in language borrowed from the visible universe. Being dependent for our vocabulary on images, if an altogether new and foreign set of Laws existed in the Spiritual World they could never take shape as definite ideas, from mere want of words. . . . If . . . the Natural Laws of the future have nothing to say of these higher Laws, what can be said of them? . . . If their disclosure could be of any practical use to us, we may be sure the clue to them, the revelation of them, in some way would have been put into Nature.'

And he adds, 'The greatest among the theological Laws are the Laws of Nature in disguise.' Now, we do not say that this passage is irreconcilable with that which we quoted first; but the difference seems to show that Mr. Drummond has not thought out clearly this

very important part of his subject, and some of his phrases go dangerously near to a subtle form of rationalism.

Another point in which the author's position wants reconsidering is the connexion between the facts of the Spiritual and those of the Natural world.

'If,' he says, 'there is any foundation for Theology, if the phenomena of the Spiritual World are real, in the nature of things they ought to come into the sphere of Law.'

But this is an important 'if,' and a few pages later Mr. Drummond returns to it.

'Does that [the existence of the Spiritual World] need proof? . . . The facts of the Spiritual World are as real to thousands as the facts of the Natural World—and more real to hundreds. . . . In either instance probably the fact would be found incapable of demonstration, but not more in the one case than the other.'

But this is 'not on the immediate programme. Science deals with known facts; and accepting certain known facts in the Spiritual World we proceed to arrange them,' &c. Now, it is clear that this assumption of a foundation cannot be sufficient for controversial or apologetic purposes. We are required to prove the existence of the Spiritual World, *qua* spiritual. No one denies that certain phenomena exist, which men, or some men, call spiritual; but science, or some science, declares that they are merely natural, and their laws are only the ordinary laws of nature, not even 'in disguise.' Before science can listen to the argument from analogy, it must be convinced that there are two distinct things between which an analogy can be drawn, and that we are not with infinite pains demonstrating the resemblance of something to itself. Mr. Drummond has not done this; and so far his method has an insecure foundation.

We must pass over some important points of criticism, such as the author's ignoring, or even (p. 236) implicit rejection of, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, and the exaggerated statement of his main position, the absolute separation between the spiritually dead and living; though he saves himself by pointing out that 'there may be cases—they are probably in the majority—where the moment of contact with the Living Spirit, though sudden, has been obscure. But the real moment and the conscious moment are two different things.' And we would add, perhaps with Mr. Drummond's approval, that the germ of life may be not only hidden, but dormant for years, and that therefore, though theoretically 'the line between the living and the dead is a sharp line,' yet, in practice, it may be imperceptible, and Life may exist in the midst of apparent Death. But our space will only allow us to call attention to what is, we believe, a very dangerous though plausible doctrine in Mr. Drummond's comparison of an indolent religion to Parasitism. A parasite feeds on the life and activity of some other animal, and Nature revenges herself by depriving it of its powers, by making it helpless, stunted, degenerate. So in religion those who manage to get their spiritual nourishment without the expenditure of work become parasitic—that is, their

spiritual faculties are undeveloped and gradually degenerate altogether. Mr. Drummond draws out the parallel with great ingenuity and force in the case of church-going, whether the sermon or the ritual be the main object, and goes on to apply it to systems of theology. With much of what he says we of course agree. The 'tendency in orthodox communities . . . to make the possession of sound beliefs equivalent to the possession of truth' cannot be defended, though it need hardly be attacked. But Mr. Drummond goes further than his analogy will allow, when to the obvious objection, 'What is doctrine but a compressed form of truth, systematized by able and pious men, and sanctioned by the imprimatur of the Church? . . . Why go over the ground again? . . . Does not Theology give him Bible truth in reliable, convenient, and, moreover, in logical propositions? There it lies . . . all cut and dry, guaranteed sound and wholesome, why not use it?' he answers, 'Just because it is all cut and dry . . . You cannot cut and dry truth. You cannot accept truth ready-made without it ceasing to nourish the soul as truth.' Here we have a very common misconception, and one which Mr. Drummond's analogy should have warned him to avoid. Why cannot truth be cut and dried? Truth, according to this analogy, is food. Food can be cut and dried; food can be prepared and ready-made, and is certainly not the worse for the process. Each man must eat it for himself, no doubt; but each man has not got to find it and prepare it for himself. So with truth. Each man must, if it is to nourish his soul, accept it as truth, be 'persuaded in his own mind,' inwardly digest it; but it does not follow that he must always start from the starting-point of his ancestors and neglect all their hardly-won victories over error. Theological doctrines are the vantage-ground of civilization in religion. The creeds are the signposts and beacon-lights to warn us from ground that experience has proved to be fatal to our course. Would Mr Drummond have each pilot take his own course, to discover for himself by final shipwreck what rocks and shoals there are in the way? Or, to take his own analogy, does not human history show us that the race advances by means of discoveries and inventions that relieve most of us from the task of providing for our lower wants, and leave us free to apply our energies to higher things, to forward the civilization of the world in new fields of effort, to adapt ourselves to new conditions as they arise? In the same way theology relieves us from the task of acquiring, putting together, selecting and preparing the elementary nourishment of the soul, and sets us free to apply the strength so gained to the new conditions of the world, to develop Christian truth as life develops, and so to advance the Church by using the discoveries of those who have gone before us. Mr. Drummond would relegate each Christian to the position of the Hebrews; 'for when by reason of the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need again that some one teach you the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God.' We have gained something by the spiritual experience of the past; we stand, by no merit of ours, above our forefathers in the faith. 'Wherefore let us cease to speak of the first

principles of Christ, and press on unto perfection : not laying again a foundation.'

We have criticized Mr. Drummond freely, and we could, did space permit, criticize him still more ; but we do not wish it to be thought that the impression left by the book is likely to be one of dissent or even of controversy. The whole tone and temper is such that the reader, as he closes it, is left with the depths of his spiritual nature stirred, pondering upon the great foundation truths of the Gospel in their relation to his own life, and illuminated with the fresh light which only a thoughtful, reverent, and lofty mind can pour upon the ancient message of Redemption.

A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament, for the use of Biblical Students. By FREDERICK HENRY AMBROSE SCRIVENER, M.A., D.C.L., LL.D., Prebendary of Exeter, Vicar of Hendon. Third edition, thoroughly revised, enlarged, and brought down to the present date. (Cambridge : Deighton, Bell and Co. London : George Bell and Sons, 1883).

STUDENTS of the Bible owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Scrivener for his invaluable labours. On tasks which many might deem dry and uninteresting, but which are none the less necessary, and which demand peculiar gifts, he has spent a large portion of his lifetime. His standard edition of the Authorized Version of the English Bible, his most useful editions of the New Testament in Greek, first with the various readings adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles, and afterwards with the Revisers' readings, his accurate collations of the Codex Bezae, the Codex Augiensis, and other manuscripts, are too well known to need description. But the most familiar and most generally useful of his works (next at any rate to his editions of the sacred text) is the *Plain Introduction* now before us. It is a mine of information for the student who desires to learn by what means the text of the New Testament was preserved for fourteen centuries and a half until the invention of printing, and what has been its history since that epoch. For full descriptions of the great uncial manuscripts, for long lists of the cursive manuscripts, for investigations into the origin and characteristics of the Versions, for the history of the printed text from the times of Erasmus and the Complutensian Polyglott to the labours of Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort, we must turn to Dr. Scrivener's pages. The volume is indispensable to the student of textual criticism, and it is not likely soon to be superseded.

The third edition of the *Plain Introduction* has been revised throughout, and has received additions, which, though not large in amount, are of considerable interest. We have now for the first time a description of the Codex Rossanensis, an uncial MS. of S. Matthew and S. Mark, dating probably from the sixth century, if not earlier, valuable to the student of Christian art as 'the earliest known copy of Scripture which is adorned with miniatures in water-colours,' and to the student of the sacred text as being 'the earliest Greek authority for the doxology in the Lord's Prayer, Matt. vi. 13.' It was practically discovered by Gebhardt and Harnack in 1879, for though

attention had been called to it before, it had not been seen by anyone who cared to use it. Unfortunately the discoverers, though they have published an account of the MS., have not yet given us a complete collation of it,¹ but from isolated specimens of its readings it may be inferred that 'in text it agrees but slightly with \aleph or B, but rather with A C Δ II. 1. 33, or with D and the Latin Versions.'

The list of cursive MSS. has received large augmentation from the indefatigable researches of the Dean of Chichester. Some of these researches were published in the *Guardian* newspaper in 1873, some were communicated to Dr. Scrivener only just in time to be included in the volume as an appendix to the preface.

'When the last sheets of this volume were about to go to press, I most unexpectedly received from Dean Burgon a catalogue of about 300 additional manuscripts of the New Testament or portions thereof, deposited in European libraries but hitherto unknown to scholars, which must hereafter be examined and collated by competent persons. The catalogue is compiled from replies to inquiries made of the several custodians by Dean Burgon, who has most liberally placed at my disposal the results of his pains and energy' (p. ix).

The complete collation of these MSS. will be a herculean task, and the result will, we fear, be quite incommensurate with the labour necessary, which might, we believe, be far more profitably expended on what Dr. Scrivener rightly points out as one of the most urgent desiderata of textual criticism, the collection and verification of the citations from the New Testament in the writings of the Fathers (chap. iv.).

The list of MSS. of the Vulgate is much improved, and an interesting sketch is given of the plan of the critical edition of the Vulgate upon which Professor John Wordsworth is engaged (p. 363). May we venture to express the hope that his well-deserved appointment to the new Oriel Professorship will give him leisure to proceed more rapidly with this invaluable work?²

The sadly disappointing character of the sumptuous edition of the Vatican MS., completed in 1881, is noticed by Dr. Scrivener. The preface

'consists of only twenty-two pages, and contains almost nothing that is interesting to the critic, much that displays superficial and newly acquired

¹ This, we are glad to say, is no longer the case. In the *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 1 Bd. 4 Hft. (Leipzig, 1883) has just appeared 'Die Evangelien des Matthäus und des Marcus aus dem Codex purpureus Rossanensis, herausgegeben von Osc. v. Gebhardt.'

² Since the above was written some *primitivæ* of Professor Wordsworth's work have appeared: 'The Gospel according to S. Matthew from the S. Germain MS. [g], now numbered Lat. 11,553 in the National Library at Paris, with Introduction descriptive of the manuscript, and five appendices containing some account of the Latin MSS. used by Erasmus and R. Stephens, the Latin and Greek MSS. collated by John Walker, with some notes on his life, and the chief defects of Martianay's collation.' *Old Latin Biblical Texts*, No. 1, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1883.

acquaintance with the whole subject. . . . The Commentary, wherein the editors attempt to distinguish the original text from the changes introduced by the second and later hands (pp. 1-170), will doubtless add much to our knowledge in respect to the Old Testament, though even there it may be thought somewhat meagre: the portion devoted to the New Testament covers only twenty-eight pages [!], and the editors seem to lean almost entirely on Tischendorf's judgment (*N.T. Vat.* 1867), adopting his notation in the main, and being usually silent when he gives no information' (p. 115).

This may be a matter of indifference to those who regard the *Codex Vaticanus* as a hopelessly corrupt text; but it is grievously disappointing to all who agree with Dr. Scrivener in considering it as 'the most weighty single authority that we possess' (p. 530); nevertheless we 'ought perhaps rather to rejoice that this great work is completed at last, than to lament that its execution is not better than, from the hands it has fallen into, we have reason to expect' (p. 115).

Dr. Scrivener's preface contains an important statement of his views with regard to the text upon which the Revised Version is based. While he feels

'that it is neither necessary nor becoming for him to undertake a formal review either of the Revised Version or of the text from which it was made, he is happy to avow his firm opinion on three points with regard to it, which have been much controverted during the last two years. First, that the task of scrutinizing the Greek text was one which the Revisers could not have shrunk from without reducing their labour to a nullity. Secondly, that the text as adopted by them, especially in passages of primary interest and importance, is far less one-sided than is generally supposed. Thirdly, that the various readings recorded in the margin are nothing better than *rejected* readings, deliberately refused a place in the text, and set in the margin, if sometimes too lightly, yet always in a spirit of fairness to the unlearned reader of Holy Scripture' (p. ix).

To this deliberate judgment on the character of the text underlying the Revised Version, we may add the following statement with regard to the influence exercised by Drs. Westcott and Hort in the formation of that text. It confirms the opinion already expressed in the pages of this *Review* (vol. xv. pp. 133-134), and coming from one who was present at all, or nearly all, the meetings of the Revision Company, must be accepted as a fair representation of the facts of the case—

'The textual labours of the Cambridge duumvirate [Dr. Westcott and Dr. Hort] have received all the fuller consideration in the learned world by reason of their authors having been members of the New Testament Revision Company, in whose deliberations they had a real influence, though, as a comparison of their text with that adopted by the Revisionists might easily have shown, by no means a preponderating one' (p. 530).

We must confess to a feeling of no small disappointment that the criticism of Dr. Hort's *Introduction* occupies only some twelve pages, and is far from being thorough and exhaustive. References to Dr.

Hort's volume are numerous throughout the book, and again and again Dr. Scrivener expresses in the strongest possible language his respect for the ability, ingenuity, and learning of the Cambridge professors, though he is unable to accept their theory or to adopt their conclusions. He calls the *Introduction*

'a treatise whose merits may be frankly acknowledged by persons the least disposed to accept his arguments: never was a cause, good or bad in itself, set off with higher ability and persuasive power' (p. 488).

It is

'a very model of earnest reasoning, calling for and richly rewarding the close and repeated study of all who would learn the utmost that can be done for settling the text of the New Testament on dogmatic principles' (p. 531).

Criticism of particular readings adopted by Drs. Westcott and Hort occupies, it is true, several pages; but almost all of it had appeared already, for before the publication of his second edition in 1874, their text had been placed in Dr. Scrivener's hands with free permission to announce their conclusions with regard to disputed readings. But this criticism for the most part rests on the subjective, and therefore uncertain, ground that the particular reading in question does not approve itself to Dr. Scrivener's judgment. The new matter dealing with Dr. Hort's volume occupies, as we have said, no more than twelve pages, and an exhaustive discussion of that elaborate work is obviously impossible within such narrow limits.

Dr. Scrivener begins by giving a brief account of Dr. Hort's 'theory' of the existence of three early types of text, the 'Western,' the 'Alexandrian,' and the 'Neutral,' from which, at some time towards the end of the third century, was formed, by a twofold process of revision, the 'Syrian' text, which is that contained, roughly speaking, in all our later MSS. But since 'not one trace' of this revision 'remains in the history of Christian antiquity,' and 'not one writer seems conscious that any modification either of the Greek Scriptures or of the vernacular translation was made in or before his times' (p. 533), he is constrained to pronounce the 'Syrian' text to be an '*ignis fatuus*,' and 'the foundations of this imposing structure' to have been laid 'on the sandy ground of ingenious conjecture.'

Let it be granted that direct historical evidence for the Syrian revision is wanting. Does Dr. Hort's classification of texts therefore fall to the ground? It is an induction from the facts which are before us in the MSS. and Versions, that certain types of text must have existed in early times, whether they came into being by gradual processes of change, or, in one case, by an authoritative revision. Dr. Scrivener fully admits the value of the process of *grouping* as the foundation of textual criticism (p. 553), and describes the characteristics of three main groups into which our authorities may be divided as follows:—

'The tendency to licentious paraphrase and unwarranted additions distinguished one set of our witnesses from the second century downwards; a bias towards grammatical and critical purism and needless

omissions appertained to another; while a third was only too apt to soften what might seem harsh, to smooth over difficulties, and to bring passages, especially of the Synoptic Gospels, into unnatural harmony with each other. All these changes appear to have been going on without notice during the whole of the third and fourth centuries, and except that the great name of Origen is associated (not always happily) with one class of them, were rather the work of transcribers than of scholars' (p. 554).

In these words Dr. Scrivener acknowledges the existence of three types of text, corresponding generally to Dr. Hort's 'Western,' 'Alexandrian,' and 'Syrian.' He really only differs as to the origin of the last named, which he thinks was due to the work of scribes, while Dr. Hort is of opinion that its phenomena can only be accounted for by the supposition of deliberate recension.

But there remains the important question of the relation of the different types of text to one another, and Dr. Scrivener proceeds to discuss the reasons which 'Two Members of the New Testament Company of Revisers, in a temperate and very able pamphlet,¹ have assigned, after Dr. Hort, but with greater precision than he, for the belief that the Syrian text is posterior in origin to those which he calls Western, Alexandrian, and Neutral' (p. 538).

(a) The first reason 'is founded on the observation that the Syrian text presents numerous instances of readings which, according to all textual probability, must be considered as combinations of early readings still extant' in the supposed earlier types of text. This argument Dr. Scrivener, in conjunction with Canon Cook (*Revised Version*, pp. 205-218) and the *Quarterly Reviewer* (April 1882, pp. 325-6), seeks to meet by affirming 'that what appears to one scholar "textual probability," appears to another a mere begging of the question' (p. 538), and that it is at least as likely that the two shorter readings are independent simplifications of the longer reading, and accordingly posterior to it, as that the longer reading is a 'conflation' of the two shorter ones. The subject no doubt 'does not admit of positive proof,' but when in a whole series of instances, and not in one or two cases merely, one text, say the 'Western,' contains one part, and another text, say the 'Neutral,' the other part, of a 'Syrian' reading, it is certainly easier to suppose that the Syrian text combines, than that the two other texts agree each to take a different part. And we cannot admit 'the plea that D and the Latins perpetually, B and its allies very often, seek to abridge the sacred original' (p. 539). As regards D and the Latin Versions, their general tendency is to amplification and paraphrase. 'No known MS. contains so many bold and extensive interpolations' as D, says Dr. Scrivener himself (p. 126); as regards B and its allies, it is begging the question at this stage of the argument to say that it abridges. Supposed omissions may at any rate be non-interpolations.

¹ *The Revisers and the Greek Text of the New Testament*. By Two Members of the New Testament Company. London: 1882.

(β) The second reason adduced by the 'Two Revisers' is derived from patristic evidence. 'Western,' 'Alexandrian,' and 'Neutral' readings are to be found in the Ante-Nicene Fathers; but no distinctively Syrian readings can be traced before the middle of the third century at the earliest. This argument Dr. Scrivener endeavours to neutralize by asserting that we are not entitled to draw any positive conclusions regarding the sacred text as known to the Ante-Nicene Fathers, partly because the materials are too vague and scanty, partly because they have as yet been very imperfectly examined. Let it be granted that much yet remains to be done in this department; still it is possible to see which way the evidence points. The particular instance quoted to prove that the evidence of the Ante-Nicene Fathers is 'by no means exclusively favourable to Dr. Hort's opinions'—namely, 'the support given to the Received Text by Hippolytus in that grand passage John iii. 13'—is not to the point. Dr. Hort regards the reading as 'Western,' and the fact that it was known to Hippolytus proves nothing more than its very early currency.

(γ) The third reason, say the 'Two Revisers,' 'is supplied by internal evidence, or in other words, by considerations . . . of intrinsic or of transcriptional probability.' Here much must rest on individual judgment, and there is room for variety of opinion. But it is hardly argument to assert of this portion of Dr. Hort's labours, that it is merely 'the reducing of a foregone conclusion to the first principles on which it rests. . . . Cod. B and its characteristic peculiarities are never out of the author's mind, and those lines of thought are closely followed which most readily lead up to the theory of that manuscript's practical impeccability' (p. 541). It is, to say the least, a possible alternative, to some minds not an improbable one, that B was really the conclusion, not the starting point, and that Dr. Hort was irresistibly led by the various lines of evidence to the conviction of its supreme excellence—not of its infallibility, which he nowhere maintains.

What, then, are Dr. Scrivener's own principles of textual criticism? They are briefly these; that where the oldest documents agree, we have no right whatever to set aside their evidence; where they disagree, later uncials and cursives are of real importance, as being the surviving representatives of other codices, as early as any now extant, or even earlier (pp. 523, 557).

Under the head of the oldest documents he includes MSS. and Versions for the Gospels up to the sixth century; for the rest of the New Testament up to the ninth century.

But in a vast number of cases these oldest authorities do not agree, and we confess that we are not satisfied with the principle of calling in secondary witnesses to decide between the disagreements of primary witnesses. It is as if the evidence of hearsay witnesses were to be received in court to decide between the discrepant statements of eye-witnesses, instead of the eye-witnesses being cross-examined to test which of them is in error, or whether both alike are at fault. A late MS. may have preserved an early reading, but on the other hand

the true reading may have been lost in all but a single one of the early copies.

In this connexion it is worth while noting Dr. Scrivener's estimate of the value of some of the oldest MSS., particularly B, and comparing it with Dr. Hort's. They agree in considering it to be the most valuable MS. extant; and although Dr. Hort would rate its trustworthiness far higher than Dr. Scrivener, the question at issue between them is only one of degree.

'We accord to Cod. B,' says Dr. Scrivener, 'at least as much weight as to any single document in existence' (p. 116). The discussion of certain readings of Cod. B,

'respecting whose authenticity, or rather genuineness, some of us must be forgiven if we cherish considerable doubts, . . . is forced upon us through no wish to dissemble the great value of the *Codex Vaticanus*, which in common with our opponents we regard as the most weighty single authority that we possess; but entirely by way of unavoidable protest against a claim for supremacy set up in its behalf, which can belong of right to no existing document whatsoever' (p. 530).

And after the examination of these readings, as if afraid of seeming unduly to disparage the merits of B, he writes:—

'Yet after all, Cod. B is a document of such value that it grows by experience even upon those who may have been a little prejudiced against it by reason of the excessive claims of its too zealous friends' (p. 552).

Dr. Hort, of course, is one of these too-zealous friends; yet surely even he is not disposed to regard B 'as an infallible voice from the Vatican' when he can write as follows:—

'To take it as the sole authority except where it contains self-betraying errors, as some have done, is an unwarrantable abandonment of criticism, and in our opinion inevitably leads to erroneous results. A text so formed would be incomparably nearer the truth than a text similarly taken from any other Greek MS. or other single document; but it would contain many errors by no means obvious, which could with more or less certainty have been avoided by the free use of all existing evidence' (Introduction, p. 251).

It would be interesting to compare the relative value assigned by the two critics to other ancient documents, but space forbids.

We fully recognize the gratitude due to Dr. Scrivener for his invaluable services and unwearied labours in the collection of materials which are indispensable to the student; yet we cannot but feel that he has failed to deal in a comprehensive and masterly way with the complicated and often perplexing phenomena of those materials, or placed textual criticism on a secure and scientific footing. The 'subjective' element of individual judgment, which Dr. Hort has aimed at reducing to the smallest possible compass, and checking in every possible way, has far too large a weight in his determinations. It may be that Dr. Hort has gone too far in the other direction, and accepted readings in the face of strong internal improbabilities, because external evidence seemed to force them

upon him. But it not seldom happens that a reading at first sight meaningless, or even repulsive, gradually wins acceptance and approval. In the 'persuasive' words of the Dean of Llandaff, quoted with approval by Dr. Scrivener (p. 543):—

'It is deeply interesting to take note of the process of thought and feeling which attends in one's own mind the presentation of some unfamiliar reading. At first sight the suggestion is repelled as unintelligible, startling, almost shocking. By degrees light dawns upon it, it finds its plea and its palliation. At last, in many instances, it is accepted as adding force and beauty to the context, and a conviction gradually forms itself that thus and not otherwise was it written.'¹

Recent Publications on Mission Work in India.

AMONG recent publications on the subject of Mission work in India we may notice *The Epiphany*, a weekly supplement to the *Indian Churchman*, intended especially for non-Christian readers. In this paper Hindus and Mohammedans are invited to state their objections to points of Christian doctrine, and these are printed with replies. We are not aware that anything precisely of this nature has been before attempted in Mission work. The first two or three numbers promise well for the future of the enterprise, and we wish it every success. The subject of Indian Mohammedanism and its literature and newest developments was for many years expounded by Monsieur Garcin de Tassy in his *Revue Annuelle*, an admirable chronicle of Indian contemporary history and a plentiful source of valuable information. Since his death a blank has been left in the records of the intellectual activity of India which much needs filling up. The great literary and educational work of Syed Ahmud Khan, with which the learned Frenchman formerly made us familiar by his numerous extracts from the Aligarh Akhbar, is in danger of being forgotten in the estimate which we make of the condition of Islam in India. Thus the Report of the *Decennial Missionary Conference*, omitting all reference to his learned bilingual Commentary on the Bible, merely describes him as 'the head of a rationalistic sect which endeavours to reconcile the spirit of the Koran with the teaching of the Christian Scriptures and with all modern science, discovery, and philosophy.' This description is also inadequate, as it omits to mention the schemes of social reform, comprising female education, in which the 'Syed Ahmud's' are in no way behind the Brahmo Somaj. But these literary Mohammedans are far removed from the mass of their people, amongst whom ignorance and bigotry prevail. Hence bazaar or street preaching among them seldom does any good, and has been strongly denounced by no less an authority than the Rev. T. P. Hughes, the experienced and able C. M. S. missionary at Peshawur. The Rev. E. Bickersteth, in an *Occasional Paper of the Cambridge Mission to Delhi*, after dwelling on some points in which Islam presents a favourable contrast to Hinduism, especially in its assertion of a personal God, shows how the Mohammedans have been losing ground both in social and political influence through their rejection of the education

¹ Vaughan, *Ep. to Romans*, Pref. to 3rd ed., p. xxi.

given in Government or Christian schools. 'The only schools in which they are to be found in any number are in those attached to mosques.' Thus Hindus have been rapidly ousting them from every Government post. Ten years ago Dr. Hunter, the able author of *Our Indian Mussulmans*, said that there is now scarcely a Government office in which a Mohammedan can hope for any post above the rank of porter, messenger, filler of ink-pots and mender of pens. This degradation of Mohammedans as compared to Hindus has continued since, and they have now even a smaller proportion amongst those who hold Government appointments. They have, however, a good school at Delhi under Government inspection, besides Syed Ahmud's College at Aligarh; and it is expected that the new Punjab University at Lahore will attract many of their students. Mr. Bickersteth calls in question the statement that the people of India are drifting slowly but surely towards the religion of Mohammed rather than Christianity, and urges that though the Mohammedans show a revival of interest in their own religion, and in parts of India they are making progress among the poor, the conversion of an educated Hindu to Islam is almost unheard of, whilst conversions from the higher ranks of Hindus to Christianity take place in India every year.

Mr. Bickersteth argues 'that the Gospel should be put before the Mohammedans of India in the way in which its own eternal truths may best link themselves on to the truths which they already hold'; and quotes in support of this the published sermons of Dr. Newman and Dr. Westcott. As to the Wahhabi movement, he regards it as an ally rather than an opponent of the work of the party of Syed Ahmud Khan. Both proceed from the close contact with Western thought, which might otherwise have caused them to fall into infidelity. A revived Islam, whether of a reformed or traditional kind, is better than the dull apathy of an uninquiring people, and presents a less serious obstacle to their acceptance of Christianity.

The Twenty Thousand Clergy and the Present Crisis; or, the Pastor in his Parish dealing with Infidelity. By the Rev. R. F. HESSEY, M.A. Second edition. (London: Skeffington, 1883.)

THIS little book, which is prefaced by a hearty endorsement of the Bishop of Winchester, is a very earnest appeal to the clergy to take their part in meeting the present widespread unbelief. The writer goes carefully through the way in which the pulpit may be used for this purpose. He would not have it 'sacrificed to barren disquisitions, which may produce the very reverse of the effect desired.' He considers that the pastor's work in this matter will rather be done, '1st, by calm, quiet, uncontroversial laying down of the grounds upon which our faith rests; 2ndly, by incidentally, and by illustration in preference to argument, removing obstacles from the path of belief; 3rdly, by adducing instances of men to whose judgment the hearers would defer, and whose deliberate verdict has been in favour of Christianity' (p. 11). Later on he passes to the 'private sphere of personal intercourse,' so necessary for those who will scarcely appreciate arguments

VOL. XVII.—NO. XXXIV. K K

without confidence in *the man*. Space will not allow us to give specimens of Mr. Hessey's happy treatment of this division of his subject. In the course of it he touches upon most of the questions now agitating men's minds, and he writes sympathetically, as one who at some time has passed through the 'searchings of heart' about which he speaks. He presses on the clergy, by many considerations, though they 'may not have equal ability to grapple with multiform doubt,' to 'be complete as far as they go,' to 'know where they are, and what they are about.' They are to rise to the duty of 'creating and sustaining an enlightened public opinion upon the alone sufficiency of the Christian Revelation to meet not only the spiritual but also the moral and intellectual requirements of the composite being, man.

The work seems to have been founded on an Address delivered at an Ember conference of clergy at Great Malvern which excited unusual interest. This it may well have done; for it is calculated to suggest how little many know, and how little many do, with respect to the unbelief of the day. It is evident that its ability and impressiveness have already produced for it a wide interest, as it has reached a second edition, and has been placed on the Supplemental Catalogue of the Christian Knowledge Society. It might be read with advantage, and thus would form a useful basis for discussion, at rural-decanal meetings.

Egypt, Palestine, and Phenicia: a Visit to Sacred Lands. By FELIX BOVET. Translated by W. H. LYTTELTON, M.A., Rector of Hagley and Canon of Gloucester, with a Biographical Sketch of the Author by Professor F. GODET, D.D. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1882.)

It was, perhaps, rather adventurous to translate a book of travels in the Holy Land which was written in 1858, for a public which has had so much fresh and valuable information on the topography of Palestine since that time. But Mr. Lyttelton's work is justified by the freshness and interest of M. Bovet's narrative, which, though some of the topographical details may be obsolete, reveals to us in the author an attractive and original personality. The fact, too, that the book still commands a sale in France shows that it is of permanent value; it has just reached an eighth edition. As to the translation, we cannot pronounce upon its accuracy, for we have had no opportunity of comparing it with the original, but it is written in a lively and vigorous style, and more than most translations, especially those from the French, it reads like an original work.

Part of the interest of M. Bovet's work consists in his experience of the inner life of the modern inhabitants of Palestine. He travelled in the *pre-Cookian* days, and refused even to resign himself into the hands of a dragoman, but took every opportunity, at some risk to himself, of seeing the life of the people with his own eyes, and of following his own course undeterred by gloomy reports of robbers. So he gives us some very pleasant and interesting accounts of the homes of the people, which often throw light upon Biblical passages, and which would be quite beyond the power of a traveller who follows only the beaten track at the bidding of a dragoman.

M. Bovet also shows great aptness and Biblical knowledge in

illustrating passages in Scripture by the facts and customs that he notes. Thus from the lofty situation of Bethlehem he explains the expression 'Ruth *went down* to the threshing-floor of Boaz': an expression which seems inconsistent with the fact that 'in all Judæa they choose by preference high situations for their threshing-floors.' Again:—

'We come upon an encampment of wandering shepherds; their tents, arranged in a circle, are made of black wool. It is to these tents of Arab shepherds that the Shulamite compares her complexion, tanned by the sun: "*I am black, like the tents of Kedar*"' (Cant. i. 5).

The extraordinary permanence of Oriental things is not confined to material objects or to customs, for even feelings and their expression seem to share it, as in the treatment of the so-called monument of Absalom (which M. Bovet is inclined to think genuine):—

'It is surrounded with a heap of small stones which conceal it from view; for still, to this day, every Jew and every Mahometan who passes by, throws a pebble at this monument, repeating the Biblical malediction, "*Cursed is he that setteth light by his father or his mother.*"'

M. Bovet is not, however, over-credulous as to the holy places, as is witnessed by his remark:—

'It has pleased the imagination of the people and of the monks to connect with a certain spot each of the steps, each of the words of Jesus; on our right, for instance, is the house of Dives, on our left that of Lazarus. My guide even wishes me to turn back a few steps, because he had forgotten to show me, in passing, *the stone which cried out.*'

Many other curious and interesting observations will be found in M. Bovet's book, which certainly has the great merit of enabling us to realize the life he saw and the places he visited. The vivid and genial style, and also, we will add, the devout and reverent tone, make the book well worth reading, and we are grateful to Mr. Lyttelton for introducing to us so good a specimen of French, or rather Swiss, Protestantism.

NEW EDITIONS, SERMONS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

A fourth edition of *Hodson of Hodson's Horse* (Kegan Paul, 1883) gives the biographer, the Rev. Prebendary Hodson, a welcome opportunity of defending his brother's memory from some recent undeserved and ungenerous attacks. His new preface is endorsed by Lord Napier of Magdala with the words, 'I am now, as I always have been, fully convinced of (your brother's) honour and integrity.'

In a lengthy pamphlet, entitled *The Increase of Immorality and the Aboycance of Church Discipline*, by the Rev. J. B. Sweet (Masters, 1883), the respected writer argues with courage and ability for the restoration of that 'godly discipline' which the Communion Service declares to be 'much to be wished.' It is well to have such claims and protests placed upon record, even if there is not much chance of such a restoration being effected in the present state of things. Mr. Sweet would have bettered his argument had he been able to show that modern England is worse in respect of public morals than other ages or countries in which a stricter discipline has theoretically pre-

vailed, or than the United States or those colonies in which the Church, being disestablished, can make canons of its own.

Mr. Burdett's *Hints in Sickness, where to go and what to do* (Kegan Paul, 1883), is a little book too valuable to be passed over. It will be invaluable to the parish priest, as giving information about all institutions in England and Wales for the relief of sickness or bodily infirmity.

Private Prayers by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D. (Rivingtons, 1883), edited by Dr. Liddon, with a Preface, will be welcome to many among us. There is reason to think that these devotions were used habitually by the revered author himself.

An Address by Canon Hole to a meeting at the Reading Church Congress has been published by the Free and Open Church Association, under the title of *The Gentleman in the Loose Box*. It is as brilliant and effective as might be expected from its author, and deserves a wide circulation.

The Archdeacon of Middlesex has printed an admirable paper on the Deceased Wife's Sister question, which he read at the Reading Church Congress. It may be bought at the office of the Marriage Law Defence Union, 20 Cockspur Street. The Union stands in need of additional pecuniary support.

Under the title of *The Fiftieth Year of the Reformation of the Nineteenth Century* (Rivingtons, 1883), Mr. Berdmore Compton has published a 'Sermon in Three Parts,' which is extremely well worth reading. Besides giving a succinct account of the leading points of the Catholic revival, these brief scholar-like sermons afford some much-needed warnings against some of the evils which have attended it.

The enormous number of tales and illustrated books, some of them exceedingly beautiful, which have been published as Christmas presents or school prizes by the S.P.C.K. in particular, and some other publishers, quite defies any detailed notice. Where all are so good, it is scarcely fair to single any out for special praise. But we think *Only a Girl*, by Miss C. A. Jones, and Andersen's *Snow Queen*, illustrated by Pym (both published by Messrs. Wells Gardner and Co.) are particularly excellent. From the S.P.C.K. list we select *Jackanapes* and *A Soldier's Children*, both by Mrs. Ewing, and a story called *Kate Temple's Mate*. A word, too, ought to be said in commendation of the S.P.C.K.'s monthly paper, *The Dawn of Day*. It is a wonderful halfpennyworth. Nor is *My Sunday Friend* (published by Mowbray and Co. at the same price) less to be recommended. The energy of the venerable Society is one of the most hopeful features of the time. That Professor James Stuart, of Cambridge, should contribute *A Chapter of Science* to its People's Library, and that another eminent scientist, the Rev. T. W. Webb, should also write for it a volume on *Optics without Mathematics*, are very notable facts. Nor is it less remarkable that Sir John Lubbock should have prepared for the National Society an advanced reading-book, called *Chapters in Popular Natural History*, embodying the results of his investigations into the habits of ants, bees, and wasps, and the relations of insects to flowers and plants.

INDEX TO VOLUME XVII.

ADV

- A**DVERTISEMENTS (of 1566), Archbishop Parker's, considered, 52 *sqq.*; did they ever receive official royal sanction? 59
 Alexandria, Patriarchs of, 9 *sq.*
 American Revised Book of Common Prayer, the, 472
 Analogies of sound and light, 318 *sqq.*
 Anglo-Israelism, the so-called arguments for, 34-47
 Animal sacrifice, universal practice of, in the ages previous to Christ, 98
 Appellate system of Rome, the, development of, under Pope Gregory the Great, 388
 Aquileia, Patriarchate of, translated to Grado, 372 *n*
 Aquileian revolt against the Papacy, 372
 Aquinas, S. Thomas, on Mammonism and Pauperism, 397 *n*
A Religious Encyclopædia (Dr. Schaff's), vol. ii. 216
 Atterbury, Dr.: his political views, 22 *sq.*; Prolocutor of Convocation, 23; his influence in Church and State, 24 *sq.*; gives his allegiance to the Stuarts, 33
 Aubé, Mons. B., *Polyeucte dans l'Histoire*, 249
 Augustine, S., his name not in the Calendar of the Church of Constantinople, 389 *n*

- B**ALDWIN, Dr., Dean of Montreal, appointed Bishop of Huron, 468
 Balme, Mr. E. B. Wheatley, on the ornaments rubric and the vestments, 47-69

BON

- Baptism as a witness to the doctrines of Christianity, 91
 Barry, Canon, *The Teacher's Prayer Book*, 246; his appointment as Bishop of Sydney, 469
 Bassett, Rev. F. T., *Examination of . . . Texts in the New Testament that relate to the Deity of our Lord*, 209
 Belgian schemes of Christian Socialism, 406 *sqq.*; successes in the field of literature, 407
 Bellett, Rev. J. C., his translation of Pelliccia's *Polity of the Christian Church*, 3 *sq.*, 14, 18
 'Benediction,' the modern Roman rite of, 13 *sq.*
 Beresford, Rev. W., *Diocesan History of Lichfield*, 357 *sqq.*
 Besant's (Mr. W.) *Life and Achievements of E. H. Palmer*, reviewed, 101 *sq.*
 Bert, Mons. Paul: his designs against religion in France, 79
 Binterim's recast of Pelliccia's work, 4
 Bithell, Mr. R., *The Creed of a Modern Agnostic*, 219
Bitter Cry of Outcast London, *The*, 422 *sqq.*
 Blunt, Rev. J. H., *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, 476
 Bread and wine, representative character of, in the Gentile sacrifices, 95
 Brownbill, Mr. J., *The Principles of English Canon Law*, 222
 Boniface III., Pope, gets the See of Rome declared by the Emperor 'Head of all Churches,' 394

BOV

- Bovet, Mons. Felix, *Egypt, Palestine, and Phœnicia*, 498
 Burdett, Mr., *Hints in Sickness*, 500
 Burnett, Bishop, on the relations of Convocation and the Crown, 25
 Bute, Marquess of, on the Egyptian Liturgies, 10

CAIRD, Principal, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, 261 *sqq.*

- Caird, Professor, *Hegel*, 264 *sqq.*
 Campello, Count di, acknowledgment of, by Bishop Littlejohn, 471; joined in his work by Monsignor Savarese, 471
 Canada, Synod of the Church of, at Montreal, 467
 Candidus, Hugo, the earliest Peterborough chronicler, 341
 Canon of the Mass, how said anciently, 13
 Cape Town, position of the Bishop of, 468
 Carpo, Rev. Father, his *Compendiosa Bibliotheca Liturgica* noticed, 1 *sq.*, 20
 Catacombs near Naples, Pelliccia's account of the, 17 *sq.*
 Catholic associations for masters and men in France, 405
 'Catholic Socialism,' the main strength of, 414
 Celtic Churches: their repudiation of Papal claims, 393
 Ceriani, Canon, *Il Rotolo Opistografo del Principe Antonio Pio di Savoia*, 225
 Challemeil-Lacour, Mons., speech of, against the French clergy, 76
 Chartism and the Christian Socialists of its time, 396
 Chasuble, derivation of the, 60
 Chichester, Mr. Stephens's *Dio-cesan History* of, criticized, 347-357; S. Wilfrid's work, 349 *sq.*; the see of Selsey, 350; removal to Chichester, 351; the fall of the Templars, 352; general condition of Sussex monasteries, *ib.*; Bishop Pecock, 353; the troublous days of the 16th century, 353 *sq.*; later history, 356
 Childebert I. (King of Paris): his

CRE

- action towards Pope Pelagius I., 373
 'Christian Social Labour Party' (Berlin), the, 416; its programme, 417 *n*
 Christian Socialism: its line of thought, 395 *sqq.*; the Duke of Saint-Simon's schemes, 398; sketch of Le Play's scheme, 400 *sqq.*; of that of Comte de Mun, 403 *sqq.*; the 'Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers,' 404 *n*; Périn and Laveleye in Belgium, 407; Christian Socialism in Germany, 410 *sqq.*; Bishop Ketteler's theory, 412; German association of masters and workpeople, 415; Christian Socialism in the Protestant Church of Germany, 415 *sqq.*; Todt's ideal, 416; 'Programme and Bylaws of the Christian Social Party,' 417 *n*; position of Protestantism, 419
 Clarke, Dr. Samuel: his Arianism censured by Convocation, 29
 Clerical marriage in the 13th century in England, 362 *n*
 Counter-revolution, the, in France, 400, 405
 'Constitutional' clergy (in France), unpopularity of the, 73
 Copes, use of, in Queen Elizabeth's reign, 50, 52, 57; in Bishop Cosin's time, 60 *n*
 Cotterill's (Right Rev. Bishop), *Does Science aid Faith in regard to Creation?* reviewed, 169 *sqq.*
 Curci, Padre, new work by, 472
 Cyriacus (of Constantinople): his relations with Pope Gregory the Great, 385
 'Cramming' in French schools, 80
 Creed, the, as the basis of Apology: periods of apologetic activity, 298; differences of method, 299; discrepancy between dogmatic and apologetic theology, 301 *sqq.*; a work desiderated to meet present needs in theology, 331 *sq.*; Dr. Westcott's *The Historic Faith* appraised, 303; removal of the misconceptions of popular theology, 305; analogy as a method of apologetics, 306; Dr. Westcott's analogy on the subject of

CRO

forgiveness, 307 *sq.*; human analogies applied to the Atonement, 309 *sqq.*; use of 'practical results' in treating theological doctrines, 311
Croyland, the story of a massacre of monks at, 341

DAUDET, Mons.: his picture of Protestantism in France, 84
Deists, English, of the 18th century: their influence on thought in France and Germany, 70
Delitzsch, Prof. Franz, *The Hebrew New Testament of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 209
Denton, Rev. W., *The Ancient Church of Egypt*, 256
D'Héricault, Mons. C., *La Révolution*, 252
Dinoh, Abbot of Bangor-Iscoed, on the Papal claims, at the Synod of S. Augustine's Oak, 393
Diocesan Fund, Bishop of Rochester's, 436
Diocesan Histories: York, Oxford, 232; *Peterborough*, 339; *Selsey: Chichester*, 347; *Lichfield*, 357
Dodwell's (Henry) book on the immortality of the soul, 29
Dress (vestments) of the clergy, Pelliccia's account of the origin of the, 10
Drummond, Mr. H., *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, 483

EASTER observance, letter of S. Columbanus on, 393
East London Church Fund, Bishop of Bedford's, 436
Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, Report of the, considered, 177-201, 437-466; members, 178; scope, 179; proposals: Diocesan Court, 182, 455; Provincial Court, 183, 455; Court of Final Appeal, 183; Recommendations, 184 *sqq.*; estimate of results, 194; Canon Stubbs's share in the work, 196; the Appendices, 198; further consideration of the proposed Court of Final Appeal, 438 *sqq.*; the 'Episcopal veto', 460; no

FRA

provision for the case of peccant bishops, 463
Egyptian Christians Monophysites merely in name, 10
English Hegelianism and its Religion; Bishop Thirlwall's and Schopenhauer's opinions on Hegel, 257; relations of philosophy and religion, 258; 'How can I know?' 260 *sq.*; Hegel's Logic, 264; Prof. Green on 'studying the book of nature', 264; definition of religion according to the school of Hegel, 265; Hegelian notion of a Revelation, 266: of the objectivity of God, 267; Prof. Green's views of the Divine Personality, 268; Hegelianism and Evolution, 269; basis of morality, 270; 'history of the just man's conscience', 272; estimate of Prof. Green's works and doctrine, 272 *sq.*; his adoption of Christian ideas, 275; meaning of 'supernatural', 275; Hegelian views of Christ and the Incarnation, 276 *sqq.*; definition of Prayer, 281; Prof. Green on Holy Communion, 282 *sq.*
Eucharist, the, as a witness to the facts of Christianity, 92
Eucharistic oblations, Pelliccia's account of the, 14
Eucharistic vesture, a distinctive: why prized and why assailed, 68
Eulogius, Patriarch of Antioch: his relations with Pope Gregory the Great, 385
Evidential value of the Sacraments, the, 85-100

FAITH and Science, relations of, considered, 162 *sqq.*
Fifth Council, the, upheld by the Papacy, 373; not accepted by the Western episcopate, 374
Fraction of the Host, Latin and Greek manners of, 13
France, prospects of religion and society in, 70 *sqq.*
Fray Gerundio—a clerical Don Quixote: imitators of Cervantes, 284 *sq.*; the author of *Friar Gerund*, 285; object and cha-

FRE

racter of the work, *ib.*; *résumé* of its contents, 287 *sqq.*; the style of preaching which the author ridicules, 290 *sq.*; life in the monasteries of the time, 293; rules for writing sermons, 294 *sq.*; a sermon of Friar Gerund's, 295 *sq.*; estimate of the book, 297

Freeman's (Rev. P.), *Principles of Divine Service*, noticed, 94 *sqq.*

French schemes of Christian Socialism, 398 *sqq.*

Froude, Mr. J. A., *Short Studies on Great Subjects*, 243

GAMS, Rev. Father, his *Series Episcoporum Ecclesie Catholicae*, noticed, 2

General Assembly of German Catholics on the question of social reform, 413

German schemes of Christian Socialism, 410 *sqq.*; peculiar circumstances affecting them, 411

Gildenburgh (or Goldenburgh), another name of Peterborough, 342

Glasscock, Mr. J. L., *The Records of S. Michael's Parish Church, Bishop Stortford*, 238

Goodwin's (Bishop Harvey,) *Walks in the Region of Science and Faith*, reviewed, 160 *sqq.*

Green, Prof., *Prolegomena to Ethics*, 264 *sqq.*; *The Witness of God and Faith*, 275 *sqq.*

Gregory the Great, Pope, sketch of his career, 379 *sqq.*; his profession of faith, 381; disputes with Constantinople, 382; on the title 'Universal Patriarch,' 383 *sqq.*; controversial value of his utterances, 386; development of the appellate system under him, 388; causes of his success, 388 *sq.*; his missionary zeal, 392; patronage of monachism, 394

Grindal, Bishop: his letter to his clergy on clerical apparel, 57; his action (as Archbishop of York) in regard to vestments, 58

Ground, Rev. W. D., *Examination of the Structural Principles of*

LAB

Mr. Herbert Spencer's *Philosophy*, 477

Guericke, Prof., *Manual of the Antiquities of the Church*, 2, 19

Guiana, the Bishop of, elected first Primate of the West Indian Churches, 469

HARMEL, Mons.: his philanthropic labours in the Val-des-Bois, 405

Hessey, Rev. R. F., *The Twenty Thousand Clergy and the Present Crisis*, 497

Hoadley, Benjamin: his appointment as Bishop of Bangor, 30; his doctrines, *ib.*

Hole, Rev. Canon, *The Gentleman in the Loose Box*, 500

Hope, Mr. Beresford, on the Ornaments Rubric, 52, 63 *n*

ἸΧΘΥΣ, symbolism of the, 90
'Immolare,' meaning of, as a sacrificial word, 94

Improvvidence and drunkenness among the London poor, 429

Incense, early use of, in the Divine Liturgy, 13

Ingham, Rev. E. G., consecrated Bishop of Sierra Leone, 460

Injunctions (of 1559), the, 50

Istrian bishops, the: their defence of the Three Chapters, 390

JACOBITES (Oriental sect) in the see of Alexandria, 9

Japan, an English bishop working in, 470

Jerusalem, line of the patriarchs of, 10

Jesuits in France, the, 78

John the Faster, 'Universal Patriarch,' 376 *sqq.*

KETTELER, Bishop: his theory of Christian Socialism, 412

LABARUM, the, depicted on the catacombs, 18; symbolism of the monogram, 90

LAN

- Landlords of London tenement houses, the, 426
- Latitudinarian bishops in the reign of George I., 33
- Laveleye, Mons. E. de, works of, on Christian Socialism, 407 sq.
- Le Play, *La Réforme Sociale*, 403
- Lettres de Alexandre Vinet*, 251
- Lias's (Rev. J. J.) *Are Miracles Credible?* reviewed, 172 sqq.
- Lichfield, Mr. Beresford's *Diocesan History* of, criticized, 357-71; great extent of the ancient diocese, 357; defects of the book noticed, 358 sqq.; Anglo-Saxon theology, 361; marriage of clergy, 362; Bishop Hugh de Nunant, 363; monastic chapter and cathedral at Coventry, 363; grave disorders in monastic communities, 364; state of religion after the suppression of the monasteries, 365; the treatment of the seminary priests, 365 sq.; the 'running lecture' of the Puritans, 367; siege of Lichfield, 368
- Liturgies, Oriental, 10
- Lodging-houses, the common, in London: types of the classes who frequent them, 425
- London Poor, the: sketch of their present state, 422 sqq.; registered lodging-houses, 424 sq.; Spitalfields, Bethnal Green, and the East End, 426 sq.; causes of distress, 427 sqq.; improvidence, 429; suggested methods of mitigating the evils, 430 sq.; the religious side of the question, 432 sq.; the Church's work, 433; the parochial system, 434; Church agencies and their work in London, 435 sqq.
- Lord's Prayer, the, its position in the Liturgy, 13
- Lyons, school work in, 80

MACLEAR'S (Rev. G. F.) *The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist*, noticed, 94 sqq.

'Mactare,' meaning of, as a sacrificial word, 94

Madagascar, position of our missionaries in, 469

NEW

- Maori opposition to marriage with a deceased's-wife's sister, 470
- Marshall, Rev. E., *Diocesan History of Oxford*, 232
- Materialism, Ancient and Modern*, 482
- Maurice, Emperor: his relations with Pope Gregory the Great, 384, 391
- Maximus of Salona: the dispute with Pope Gregory the Great about his consecration, 391
- Medeshamstede, ancient name of Peterborough, 340
- Mirabeau on the Episcopate, 72
- Miracle at Beth-Horon, a critical examination of the: the popular interpretation of the miracle, 313 sq.; a new interpretation proposed, 316; defended, 317 sqq.; philological illustrations, 318 sqq.; application of the interpretation, 326; two accounts of the miracle combined: the Book of Joshua and the Book of Jasher, 328; analogous instances, 330 sq.; objections to the usual interpretation, 333 sq.; various explanations of the passage, 335 sq.; the miraculous sign given to Hezekiah, 337
- Mission Work in India, recent publications on, 496
- Montalembert: his sympathies with England, 74
- Montgomery, Miss, *Thoughts for Holy Days and Vigils*, 256
- Moufang, Rev. Canon, on the social programme of the Catholic Church, 413
- N**ARSES, Viceroy of Italy: his position towards Pelagius I., 372 sq.
- 'Neutrality' in French schools (*l'école neutre*), 81
- New Editions, &c., 256, 501
- New Education Code, the, considered, 140 sqq.; grants, under the previous Code, 142 sq., under the new Code, 145 sqq.; the question of the health of school-children, 148 sqq.; description of a school-inspection, 150 sqq.; pe-

CEU

cuniary results under the new Code, 153; results in voluntary schools in London, 154 *sq.*; comparative results (1882, 1883) in schools in an agricultural county, 155; in large towns, 156; general financial results, 158; evils to be mitigated, 158 *sq.*; prospects of voluntary schools, 160 *sq.*

‘ŒUVRE des Cercles Catholiques d'Ouvriers,’ programme of, 404

Old Catholics, statistics of the congregations of, 470; proposition as to Communion under both kinds, *ib.*; their position in Austria, 471

Ornaments Rubric (1559), the, account of, 48 *sqq.*; the Rubric of 1661-2, 59 *sq.*; the real meaning of the latter, 63 *sq.*

Ormsby, Canon, *Diocesan History of York*, 232

‘Ostensoria’ introduced in the fifteenth century, 13

PALMER E. H., Mr. Besant's *Life* of, reviewed, 101 *sqq.*; sketch of Palmer's early years, 103 *sq.*; his gift of acquiring languages, 104 *sqq.*; study of Oriental literature, 107; obtains a sizarship at Cambridge, 108; Fellow of S. John's College, 110; *The Desert of the Exodus*, 111; researches in the Sinaitic Peninsula, 112 *sqq.*; candidate for the Professorship of Arabic at Cambridge, 114 *sqq.*; account of the election of Dr. Wright to that post, 117 *sq.*; Palmer appointed Reader in Arabic, 120; enters at the Middle Temple, 121; literary and other work, 122; his disposition, 123 *sq.*; character of his Oriental scholarship, 126 *sq.*; narrative of incidents connected with his murder, 127 *sqq.*

Papacy, the, 371-394; its state under Pelagius I., 372; the Istrian schism, *ib.*; the Pope's letter to the Tuscan bishops, 373;

PEL

the Fifth General Council, 373 *sq.*; reign of Pelagius II., 374; negotiations with the Istrian bishops, 374 *sq.*; Pelagius's Tome, 375; the assumption of the title ‘Universal Patriarch’ by John the Faster, 376 *sqq.*; reign of Gregory the Great, 378 *sqq.*; his profession of faith, 381; his quarrel with Constantinople, 382; extracts from Gregory's letters on the title ‘Œcumenical Patriarch,’ 383 *sqq.*; object of his contention, 387; development under him of the appellate system of Rome, 388; causes of Gregory's success, 388 *sqq.*

Papal approval not held necessary to validate the acts of a Council, 374

Parker, Archbishop: his letters to Bishop Grindal, 53 *sq.*

Patena: Pellicia's derivation of the word, 12

Patristic approval claimed for Socialism, 397

Pelagius I., Pope, the reign of, 372; his profession of faith, 373

Pelagius II., Pope, the reign of, 374 *sqq.*; his negotiations with the Istrian bishops, 375; on the Three Chapters, *ib.*; on the title ‘Universal Patriarch,’ 376; his letter to the Eastern bishops, 377; his death, 378

Pelliccia's *Polity of the Christian Church*, reviewed, 1 *sqq.*; character of the work, 2; sketch of the author's life, *ib.*; his works, and his style, 3; definition of the Church, 5; on baptism and confirmation, 6; the ordination of presbyters, 7; primitive Church government collegiate, 8; origin of the ecclesiastical *ἐπισκοπος*, *ib.*; position of the Roman Pontiff, 9; on the Patriarchates, 10; clerical dress, (vestments), 10 *sq.*; the ‘sacred places of Christians,’ 11; on the Sacred Books (for Divine Service), 12; ‘ostensoria,’ 13; Eucharistic bread, 14; marriages and funerals, 14, 17; Extreme Unction, 15; the Viaticum, 16; cemeteries or catacombs, 17

PER

- Périn, Mons. C., works of, on Christian Socialism, 407 sq.
 Perowne, Ven. T. T., *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges: Obadiah and Jonah*, 208
 Peterborough, Mr. Poole's *Diocesan History* of, criticized, 339-347; the legendary tales of Bede, 341; the false privilege grants, *ib.*; notices of various abbots of Peterborough, 342 sqq.; the *Chronicon Petroburgense*, 345; post-medieval history of Peterborough, 346
 Phases of Christian Socialism abroad, 395-421
 Political economy, rising school of, in Germany, 411
 Poole, Rev. G. A., *Diocesan History of Peterborough*, 339 sqq.
 Poverty and overcrowding in London, 427; some of the causes of, 427 sq.
Private Prayers by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, 500
 Processional cross, its use by patriarchs, &c., in the East and West, 10
 Protestant Church in Germany: its relations with Christian Socialism, 415

RATZINGER, Herr G., *Political Economy on Moral Principles*, 414

- Reign of Terror, treatment of the clergy in the, 73
 Reinkens, Bishop, decennial anniversary of his consecration, 470
 Religion and society in France, prospects of, 70 sqq.; the question of secular education, 70; state of religion during and after the Revolution, 72 sqq.; 'liberty of instruction' (1830-1848), 74; education under Napoleon III., 75; Ministerial attacks on the clergy, 76 sqq.; dissolution of religious orders, 78; M. Paul Bert's notions, 79; 'Cramming' in French schools, 80; 'neutrality' in school-teaching, 81; *Pécolo sans Dieu*, 82 sq.; Protes-

SEE

- tantism of little account in France, 84
 Religious orders in France, the dissolution of the, 78
 Remedies suggested for the evils of outcast London, 431
 Rendall, Mr. F., *The Epistle to the Hebrews in Greek and English*, 205
 Reservation of the Eucharist, Pelliccia's account of, 16
 Retrospect, Foreign, of 1883, 470
 Roman Liturgy, the most ancient manuscript of the, 226
 Rupert's Land, provincial synod in, 468

- S**ACHEVERELL, Dr., impeachment of, 21 sq.
 Sacramental (Extreme) Unction, ancient use of, 15; a non-sacramental unction also practised, *ib.*
 Sadler, Rev. M. F., *The Gospel according to S. Matthew*, 206
 Saint-Simon, Duke of, called the father of Christian Socialism, 398
 Salazar, Francis Lobăn de (Father Joseph Francis Isla, S. J.), *Historia del Fray Gerundio*, 284
 Sanderson, Robert, on the Ornaments Rubric, 61
 Sandford, Rev. Canon, appointed Bishop of Tasmania, 469
 Sandys, Mr. R. H., *Anti-Theism: Remarks on its Modern Spirit*, 481
 Schaff, Dr. P., *History of the Christian Church: Apostolic Christianity*, 210; *A Religious Encyclopedia* (vol. ii.), 216
 Schopenhauer on the philosophy of Hegel, 258
 S. Columbanus, letter of, to Pope Gregory the Great on Easter observance, 393
 Scrivener, Rev. Dr. F. H. A., *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 489
 Second Empire, the: mischief wrought by its corruptions, 70
 Secular education in England and France, 70
 Seebohm, Mr. F., *The English Village Community*, 230

SHA

- Shaftesbury, Lord, on the parochial system, 434
 Shaw, Mrs. E. M., *Marriage as affected by the proposed Change in the Marriage Laws*, 256
 Simon, M. Jules : his *Dieu, Patrie, Liberté*, noticed, 71 sq.
 Sims, Mr. G. R., *How the Poor Live*, 422 sqq.
 S. John Cassian named only in the Marseilles Kalendar in the West, 389 n
 Smalridge's (Dr.) laudations of Dr. Atterbury, 23
 Smythies, Rev. C. A., consecrated bishop of the mission to Central Africa, 469
 S. Nicetius of Lyons, anecdote about his *casula*, 69 n
 Socialism and Christianity, contrast between the theories and methods of, 420
 Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge : its publications for the young, 500
 Sound, words originally suggestive of, frequently applied to light, 318 sqq.
 South African Church, position of the, 468
 State-aided schools and Church schools in France, the struggle between, 80
 Stephens, Rev. W. R. W., *Diocesan History of Selsey : Chichester*, 347 sqq
 Suppression of Convocation, 21-33 ; impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell, 21 sq. ; Atterbury's political views, 22 ; relations of Convocation and the Crown, 25 ; Atterbury's power, 25 sq. ; dispute about a Representation on the state of religion, 27 ; dispute between Bishops and Presbyters as to lay baptism, 28 sq. ; Dr. Stanhope, Prolocutor (1714), 29 ; useful labours of Convocation, 29 sq. ; proposed action against Bishop Hoadley's doctrines pre-

WRI

- vented by prorogation, 32 ; repeated prorogations, 33 ; feelings of the clergy, 33 sq
 Sweet, Rev. J. B., *The Increase of Immorality and the Abeyance of Church Discipline*, 500
 Switzerland, the Christian Catholic Church of, 471

THEOLOGISCHE Literatur-zeitung, 254

- The S.P.C.K. *Prayer-Book Commentary* and *The Teacher's Prayer-Book*, 246
 Thirlwall, Bishop, on the philosophy of Hegel, 257
 Three Chapters, the, Papal disputes on, 375
 Tillemont's *Life of our Saviour* translated into Italian by Pelliccia, 2
 Todt, Herr R., *Radical German Socialism and Christian Society*, 415 sq.
 Triennial Convention of the Church of the United States, 467 ; a century's work of that body, *ib.*
 Turner, Bishop (of Grafton and Armidale, Australia), *Pastoral Letter on Anglo-Israelism*, 245

- WACE, Dr. H., *The Gospel and its Witnesses*, 217
 Warrington, Mr. G., *Can we Believe in Miracles ?* 336
 Warren, Mr. F. E., *The Leofric Missal*, 227
 Weiss, Dr. B., *The Life of Christ*, 214
 Westcott, Dr., *The Historic Faith*, 303 sqq.
 West Indies, the dioceses of the, grouped into one province, 469
 Wheatley Balme, E. B. See Balme
 Whiston's *Book on Primitive Christianity*, 28
 Wright, Rev. C. H. H., *The Book of Koheleth*, 202

2 ; re-
eelings

rease of
ance of

atholic

eratur-

e Com-
acher's

philo-

al dis-

aviour

y Pel-

uan So-
Society,

Church
; a cen-
ib.

on and
astoral
n, 245

pel and

Believe

Leofric

Christ,

e Faith,

of the,
e, 469
e Balme
e Chris-

he Book